The University of Chicago

GROVER CLEVELAND AS A POLITICAL LEADER

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

1937

By

PEARL LOUISE ROBERTSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939

The University of Chicago

GROVER CLEVELAND AS A POLITICAL LEADER

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

1937

By

PEARL LOUISE ROBERTSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CHAPTER II

CLEVELAND'S PERSONALITY AS A POLITICAL LEADER

In the absence of definite tests for determining or measuring the qualities of political leadership, the student of politics must use the available approaches of the present time. Some of the most suggestive studies in the physical traits of people have been provided by Kretschmer, Bleuler, Stockard, Draper and others. Kretschmer's, as the most completely developed theory, will be used here.

Factual information and the common sense approach provide a means for discussing the mental traits of the individual, although Freud and Adler posit stimulating theories on professional pursuits. On the career line of the individual certain types of behavior emerge that the Freudian analysis may clarify if we use Freud's interpretation of the three levels--id, ego and super-ego. Too, Professor Lasswell's study in types of administrators affords explanation of the basic causes of behavior of the administrative leader.

To evaluate Cleveland's qualities as a political leader from an objective point of view, we must use the tests at hand compiled by observers and students of human nature and of politics. In this connection, Professor Merriam's list is significant because most comprehensive, with those of Michels, Conway, Ross and others useful in lesser degree. Without hope of finality, but with expectation of determining the main qualities of Cleveland that enabled him to function in the political situation, the following chapter is written.

Physical Characteristics of Grover Cleveland

Studies by Kretschmer, Berman, Naccarati, Bleuler, Stockard and others have indicated the importance of physical characteristics as a possible index to the individual's personality. Cleveland's general appearance, size, features, dietary and health habits suggest the pyknic type described by Kretschmer, who observed, as well, certain temperamental qualities which he

thought associated with the pyknic physical make-up that Cleveland seems to approximate.[1]

In size and features Cleveland resembles more closely the pyknic type distinguished as one of three general types by the German psychiatrist.[2] He is said to have been a fat child, and although more slender in puberty, developed into a large man. Observers spoke of his "large and powerful frame"; several mention him as "massive"[3] or as "a massive and even corpulent man."[4] Noah Brooks describes him as "large, florid, and impressive."[5] Champ Clark pictures him at Harrison's inaugural "towering a full head over Harrison and weighing twice as much," and again he mentions the Democratic nominee in 1892, "He stood five feet ten of massive build and weighed close to three hundred pounds. His girth was aldermanic."[6] Robert La Follette spoke with disappointment of his "coarse face, heavy inert body and shapeless hands."[7]

Cleveland's large build with tendency toward fat was an asset for leadership. "A fine physique," declares Bogardus, "is essential for certain types of leaders and helpful in all, because in the processes of interaction the group oftentimes falsely identifies size and ability."[8] Gowin more explicitly cites figures to prove that the executive tends to exceed the average in height and weight, attributing this in part to the superior energy and endurance that accompanies superior size, but in part to the social prestige that impressive size conveys.[9] Allport agrees

---

[1]Ernest Kretschmer, Physique and Character (New York, 1925).

[2]From clinical studies Kretschmer classified three main physical types: the asthenic, athletic and pyknic with a fourty, the dyplastic or mixed. He described two personality types: schizophrenic and cycloid.

[3]Edmund James Cleveland and Horact Gillette Cleveland, Genealogy of the Cleveland and Cleaveland Families (Hartford, Conn., 1899).

[4]Chicago Evening Post, June 24, 1908.

[5]Statesmen (New York, 1894), p. 345.

[6]My Quarter Century of American Politics (New York, 1920), I, 22.

[7]Autobiography, p. 52, cited by Allan Nevins, Grover Cleveland (New York, 1933), p. 206.

[8]Emory Bogardus, Essentials of Social Psychology (Los Angeles, 1920), p. 411.

[9]Enoch B. Gowin, The Executive and His Control of Men (New York, 1927).

that tallness of stature, though not always necessary, is of great service to leaders.[1] More recent studies investigating the physical qualities of leaders estimate the average height of forty-six governors as 5 feet, 11 inches, weight 182 pounds or over.[2] Cleveland measures up well on this basis as to height and weight.

Cleveland's features confirm the pyknic delineations suggested by Kretschmer's studies. His portraits show a strong Roman nose, blue or blue-gray rather small eyes and a strong jaw embellished by a definite double chin. His face had the breadth, softness and rotundity of the pyknic type. His large skull was round, broad and deep. His hair was a faded sandy shade or light brown, the delicate hair of the cycloid, which, according to Kretschmer, tends to disappear. A contemporary records that

> . . . . his hair was thin and the top of his head was bald. His double chin became a prominent feature of campaign art and seemed to lend distinction to his face. In short, he was fat and forty, or more correctly speaking, forty-seven.[3]

The voice of the pyknic type, Kretschmer found, was not usually so powerful as the body build might suggest. One would expect Grover Cleveland to boom out in a powerful bass. But the investigator must depend on the testimony of the leader's contemporaries, and it varies. Cleveland seems to have been another example of the big man with the little voice. At least it was not a powerful voice. "His voice in conversation was a little higher than one might expect from such a large man; it was undoubtedly what foreigners would call an American voice, somewhat nasal, although not unplesant."[4] One reporter refers to his voice at the first inaugural as "deliberate and strong."[5] Some thought his voice had a tenor quality "not resonant or strong but one which

---

[1]Floyd Allport, Social Psychology (New York, 1924), p. 422.

[2]Ordway Tead, Leadership (New York, 1935), p. 85. Also, insurance statistics indicate that of 6,037 leading men, average height was 71.4 inches, average weight 181.1 pounds. Cited by Coleman Griffith in Introduction to Applied Psychology (New York, 1934), chap. x.

[3]Article by editor of Chicago Evening Post, June 24, 1908, "Grover Cleveland's Life, an Inspiration" describing Cleveland in 1884.

[4]Collier's, August, 1908.

[5]Chicago Journal, June 24, 1908.

had remarkable carrying power so that in public speaking he could be heard at a considerable distance."[1] Too, it was described as "harsh and sometimes shrill" and as "a weak voice for such a large man."[2] Matilda Gresham was even more frank in her appraisal. "I watched Mr. Cleveland very closely. He was far and had a squeaky voice."[3] Although not a decided asset in speaking, enither very powerful nor musical, Cleveland's voice was adequate for public speaking and stronger in delivery of addresses than in conversation.

Since physical heredity is such an important factor in the functioning of the total personality, it might be well here to indicate some tendencies in Cleveland's heredity that contributed to his longevity and strength. In Cattell's tests of 885 leading men of science and the professions the clergy ranked highest for longevity and strength,[4] and although Cleveland's father, the Reverend Richard Cleveland, died at the age of forty-nine, there is evidence of longevity in the remoter paternal ancestry that bears out Cattell's observations. Cleveland's father seems to have approximated the gentler cyclothyme type in appearance and personality. He died of a disease common to the circular personality, gastro-intestinal ulcers with complications of peritonitis.[5] Cleveland's mother died at the age of seventy-six; her portraits reveal sterner cyclothyme features, a more assertive expansive personality than the father's. Grover Cleveland died at the age of seventy-one in 1908. Dr. Joseph Bryant, his family physician and personal friend, together with Dr. George C. Lockwood and Dr. J. M. Carnochan issued the following statement to the press:

> Mr. Cleveland for many years suffered from repeated attacks of gastro-intestinal origin. Also he had long standing disease of the heart and kidneys. Heart failure complicated with pulmonary thrombosis and oedema were the immediate cause of death.[6]

---

[1] Harry Peck, Twenty Years of the Republic (New York, 1907), p. 58.

[2] Statement of Professor William F. Brewer, Bozeman, Montana.

[3] Life of Walter Q. Gresham (Chicago, 1919), II, 689.

[4] J. M. Cattell, American Men of Science (New York, 1910); see also Havelock Ellis, A Study of British Genius (Boston, 1926).

[5] Allan Nevins, Grover Cleveland - a Study in Courage (New York, 1933), p. 21.

[6] Issued to Associated Press, published June 25, 1908 in leading newspapers.

Cleveland thus appears to have inherited a tendency toward long life and toward certain disorders in old age as well as a fundamentally strong physique, necessary to a political leader.

His childhood appears to have been a healthy one. According to Lewis Allen he suffered an attack of typhoid fever during the first year in Buffalo.[1] In later years he complained of rheumatism and suffered from gout, complicated by his obesity and eating habits, both, according to Kretschmer, marks of the pyknic health pattern.[2] In 1893 Cleveland submitted to a serious operation for removal of a malignant growth in the mouth; the entire upper left jaw was removed, and a part of the soft palate; he was fitted with an artificial jaw of rubber. This operation occurred during the silver repeal agitation on July 1; when Congress met August 7, Cleveland had recovered sufficiently to write his message, basic good health contributing to his quick recovery. His speech was unaffected by the artificial jaw, so for a number of years the story of the operation was unknown.[3] The chief concern of the doctors was the possible effect of ether on the patient, whose corpulence and fatigue made him a fit subject for apoplexy.[4]

Cleveland's attitude toward his own health was the average person's interest; he seemed to think the weather had a lot to do with it;[5] but he wasted no energy worrying about his condition, as did Blaine when in one of his hypochondriac moods, so that he was able to accomplish a vast amount of work essential to his political success. In fact, his health was affected by rigid adherence to the details of office; it was never so vigorous after he left the White House. His friends often advised exercise,[6]

---

[1]Nevins, op. cit., p. 35.

[2]Kretschmer, op. cit., p. 83.

[3]See account by Dr. W. W. Keen, The Surgical Operations on President Cleveland (Philadelphia, 1917). An account of the operation appearing in the Philadelphia Press on August 29, 1893 was so successfully denied that the real story remained a secret until publication of Dr. Keen's account.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Frequent entries in Cleveland's diary indicate interest; also article in Saturday Evening Post by George F. Parker, November 10, 1923.

[6]Letter from Charles R. Codman dated 1885, Cleveland Collection; letter from Silas Burt, May 15, 1886.

but the only exercise he really enjoyed was sitting in boat hauling in a black bass. Even as governor, Cleveland began to feel the effects of hard work and lack of exercise, confessing to Bissell:

> I will tell you as the deadest secret in the world that for the past few days I have felt the effects of long hours steady work and the worse than incessant pester about offices. I honestly can't think I can stand it more than two weeks longer. My head a good deal of the time dont feel right, and when a man begins to talk about office I begin to get irritable and my head begins to ache.[1]

Just before his inaugural as governor he began to suffer from sleeplessness that persisted at intervals for the rest of his life. He attributed it to "this cursed office filling in my dreams"[2] and added,

> I feel well most of the time, though occasionally I dont sleep as much as I ought. I dont need a great deal, but pitching about half awake trying to make postmasters is not good preparation for a hard day's work.[3]

The enormous energies attributed to the pyknic type by Kretschmer,[4] Cleveland seems to have possessed, and this physical foundation for hard work was important to a leader who lacked brilliance and originality.

Cleveland's eating habits, too, fit in with the cyclothyme profile; most circulars enjoy eating and drinking, habits that aggravate the inherent tendency toward rheumatism and stomach disorders. Cleveland's preferences for food were those of the hearty eater; he liked substantial fare and plenty of it, favoring a diet that carried excess of starches and fats. Oscar Straus speaks of his fondness for delicatessen and beer and German dishes. Reporters tell of seeking him not at bars but in eating houses of Buffalo noted more for quantity than quality of food. Cleveland records a visit of Commodore Benedict when they "played cribbage in the evening. We all lunched with Professor West on sauer kraut and sausage."[5] However, these midnight lunches did not agree with

---

[1]Letter dated April 22, 1883.

[2]Letter to Charles Goodyear, quoted in Armitage, Grover Cleveland as Buffalo Knew Him (Buffalo, 1926), p. 332.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Kretschmer, op. cit., p. 131.

[5]Entry in Cleveland's diary for December 28, 1899, Cleveland Collection, Library of Congress.

him, and on one occasion of a visit to Dr. Finley's to watch the year out he admits, "I ate Welsh rarebit and other things and was sick this morning."[1] Even in old age he refused to modify his eating habits unless compelled to do so.

Thus, according to Kretschmer's analysis of the pyknic type and other measurements, Cleveland's physical endowment was a great asset to energetic public life. He possessed impressive size, height and weight above average, good expectations of longevity, fundamental good health, a moderately forceful voice and enormous energies.

Kretschmer also suggests certain temperamental qualities that he would associate with the pyknic type, qualities that Cleveland was reputed to have exhibited in certain situations. Among these are easy identification with the milieu, hastiness, diligence, skill in handling men, and an astonishingly clear mind for the right moment.

Mental Traits of Grover Cleveland

The impulse to expend energy, to release the libido in activity and the easy identification of the cycloid with his environment, as well as the need for making a living, led Cleveland early to the choice of a profession. According to his uncle Lewis Allen, young Grover in 1854 was on his way to Cleveland, Ohio, "where he hoped to enter law."[2] Before the boy there was no immediate example of professional distinction in the family; his father had been content in an inferior small town position. However, a certain professional tradition persisted; William, the eldest son attended Hamilton College with a view to the ministry and the second son trained in engineering.[3] Cleveland's experience in the New York Institute for the Blind proved bleak and uninteresting and destroyed any possible inclinations toward the teaching profession. Disinclined toward the ministry and lacking studious inclinations, Cleveland probably had no very definite plans in mind when he went westward. But Buffalo offered opportunities

---

[1] Diary, January 1, 1904.

[2] Statement in Buffalo Courier copied in New York Times, July 16, 1886.

[3] Nevins, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

for a law education not afforded at home. As late as the sixties a college education was not required training for practice and achievement in the law; none of the partners of Rogers, Bowen and Rogers were college men. After three and a half years of study Cleveland passed the bar examination in May, 1859, not a brilliant record in a day when Blackstone was the chief requirement.

Intensive not extensive was his knowledge of the law; "he was a close reader of the authorities and in his old-fashioned way Blackstone was the foundation of his reading."[1] It is difficult to separate the partisan views of party friends from an objective opinion of Cleveland's achievements in his profession. When he was nominated for district attorney, the Courier spoke of him as a man "whose close application, gentlemanly deportment and conceded ability have given him a standing at the bar which has seldom been gained by one of his years."[2] Armitage decided from the evidence that Cleveland ranked high at the local bar.[3]

> Best proof of this [said Judge Joseph V. Seaver] that the lawyers sought his appointment as a referee. They knew they would get sound law and a square deal. It's true that as a lawyer Cleveland was a bit lazy but the same could with truth be said of other lawyers of eminence within the range of my acquaintance.[4]

Senator Frank M. Loomis testified to the same effect:

> Lawyers liked him as a referee because they knew his decisions would be founded on law. I recall one case I had before him where I had law on my side and was given the decision, although in his opinion Mr. Cleveland made it plain that he considered the equities to be the other way.[5]

Certain personality traits contributed to Cleveland's success as a lawyer--unusual industry and energy in release of tensions and anxieties, interest in details, conservatism of disposition without any broad interests or sympathies that might distract him from the immediate business at hand. Lack of acquisitiveness kept him satisfied with advisory work, chiefly for corporations, and his stubbornness in sticking to a point of view once arrived at impressed others. He never left anything to

---

[1] Springfield Weekly Republican, June 25, 1908.

[2] Nevins, op. cit., p. 54.

[3] Armitage, op. cit., p. 43.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., p. 44.

inspiration, as indeed he could not, but prepared each case thoroughly. His accepted conventionalism in the law was recognized by his election as chairman of the local bar association.

Hovey in his life of Morgan cites Cleveland's acceptance of the bond issue plan as the recognition of "a trained lawyer that Mr. Morgan's plan was no new idea."[1] After his defeat in 1888, he became counsel but not active member of the firm of Bangs, Stetson, Tracy and MacVeagh in New York City; the work involved a judicial technique in which Cleveland's authoritarian impulses received expression. In Buffalo Cleveland's firm had handled cases for the New York Central, and the Stetson firm was noted for corporation reorganization, especially for connection with the house of Morgan. Neither environment nor temperament prepared Cleveland to question the social significance of this work; he accepted the social situation in which he found himself. Such was his limitation to the immediate aspects of any job at hand.

That much of Cleveland's hard professional work was based on personal need to expend energy and not upon ambition to achieve some definite future became clear when he retired to Princeton and a life of regression from activity after his second term in office. He accepted a nominal position with the Equitable Life Insurance Company but showed little interest in the law thereafter. Upon a paternal attitude of caring for the affairs of the nation, of watching each move in the political drama after 1896, he rationalized stresses that were formerly expressed in hard work and generalization about the duties of office. The extreme desire for approbation met recognition only in public office and in the executive phase of activity; he easily displaced the objective of professional success with the more remunerative one, affectionally speaking, of public success, and cared little about the achievements of the law thereafter.

Cleveland's carelessness in regard to his own financial and business affairs (lack of narcissism and personal acquisitiveness) contrasts with his attention to the details of public business. He relied on Bissell and Lamont for advice on stocks and taxes.[2] Early investments in property and land in Buffalo

---

[1]Carl Hovey, Life Story of J. Pierpont Morgan (New York, 1911), p. 184.

[2]Letters in Cleveland Collection, Library of Congress.

gave him an estimated $100,000 when he entered public life. At his death his wealth was estimated at one to two millions, chiefly in houses and real estate in New York City and Buffalo. The principal part was in stocks; he had lost some in the failure of the Knickerbocker Trust Company.[1] Clark remarked that Cleveland was the only president to have made money in Washington real estate--chiefly from the sale of his suburban home Redtop; after he built Redtop a building boom started in the suburb, greatly enhancing the value of this property. His correspondence with Bissell lends credulity to the assumption that he was careless about his personal financial affairs. For example he wrote often in the following strain: "Yours received. I should have said that the tax was paid at first sight but guess it is not. If you will pay for it you may take it out of my corn crib."[2] He disregarded business forms and often sent money to his mother through the mails. "It is hard to exaggerate the simplicity of Mr. Cleveland's most characteristic methods," said the Transcript, "whenever he wanted to send 5 dollars to an indigent relative he slapped the greenback in to the letter in defiance of the warnings of his own postoffice and in disregard of the convenient system of checks and drafts."[3]

Cleveland's work as a lawyer placed a premium on practicality and decision; he dealt with tangible and concrete situations involving knowledge of the law and of the immediate situation. He lacked a broad education and a home environment that was intellectual, however theological it might have been. Temperamentally he was inclined to the task of the immediate milieu; he lacked both intellectual curiosity and opportunity for its satisfaction. It must be concluded, then, that the range of his knowledge was narrow, and although he acquired information on various subjects while in office because of his hard work and capacity for details, he lacked any broad basis of understanding of history, economics or politics that could project his information into a more objective frame of reference than personal conviction and feeling. This deficiency became an asset in some situations where steadfastness to purpose and conviction of right are more impressive

---

[1] Baltimore News, June 24, 1908.

[2] Letter to Bissell, January 8, 1884.

[3] Boston Transcript, June 27, 1908.

to the popular mind than range of knowledge or breadth of understanding. He had a single track, logical mind that dealt with fundamentals, that persisted in digging out a problem once presented. "A mind disinclined to theory," said Woodrow Wilson, "very firm and definite in its operation on facts, intolerant of too great refinement but admirable in the application of principles, a broad effective, decisive comprehending mind, fit always for affairs or action."

Although not "mentally dark" as described by Jones of Nevada, Cleveland thought slowly and deliberately; however, nothing in his professional experience called for imagination or brilliance, qualities that may handicap the lawyer. His mental outlook was conditioned by the necessity of action and the application of law, and his temperament suited the conditions. Oscar Straus said that he had an honest and logical mind: "He would mull over a question until he got to the bottom and then he would start to build up his premises and arrive at his conclusions."[1] When he served as director of the Equitable, Cleveland made a study of the insurance problem, and one of the young presidents was quoted as saying "now the old man knows more about insurance than the rest of us."[2] Even the Republican press conceded that his speeches were impressive in their thoroughness and gave evidence of long and careful study.[3]

He impressed many by his excellent memory in youth. In his profession he acquired the habit of memorizing cases and delivered his inaugural addresses without manuscript, leading Ingalls to exclaim on one occasion, "God, what a magnificent gambler!"[4] But these speeches were preceded by long hours of work and memorizing; he left nothing to chance. It is difficult to estimate the use of his memory in the preparation of speeches and public papers, for he worked long and industriously at them all. When at work on a speech, he kept the materials in the top drawer of the desk to be drawn out in any free moments. Certainly in

---

[1]Oscar Straus, Under Four Administrations (Boston, 1922), p. 109.

[2]Jesse Lynch Williams, "Grover Cleveland," American Magazine (April, 1909), pp. 532-41.

[3]New York Herald, Sept. 11, 1888.

[4]Nevins, op. cit., p. 206.

later years he could not rely on his memory of facts to construct a lecture on the Venezuelan matter with which he had had intimate touch at the time, for he wrote Olney:

> I have been struggling with the Venezuelan question with a view of talking to students and others about it on the 27th and 28 inst. Can you tell me without bother who made the first move at arbitration as between us and Great Britain and how it was done?"[1]

Originality Cleveland lacked to great degree; the phrases he was reputed to have struck off, like "public office is a public trust" were familiar to the lawyers of his time if not to the public. He never showed the slightest interest in creative work of any kind; his writing was practical, definite and necessary to some occasion. Other presidents have lacked knowledge of certain economic and political situations in the country but have been able through imagination to extend their interests and sympathies beyond the borders of the White House Office. But not so Cleveland. A disparaging critic said:

> He had most of all no imagination. What the West and South were, their wants, their rights, their strength, loomed but vaguely, lost in that mighty fog of no imagination and what he didn't know.[2]

Gamaliel Bradford neatly limned Cleveland's type of mind: "He did not generalize, did not move readily and swiftly among abstract ideas, did not spring immediately to the far reaching significance of the immediate; he had rather the lawyer's close and anxious search for precedent."[3] Ford, too, characterized Cleveland mentally as "stanch, plodding, laborious and dutiful but lacking in ability to penetrate to the heart of obscure political problems and to deal with primary causes rather than with effects."[4]

Cleveland's main mental characteristics, we must conclude, reflect a lack of broad knowledge but ability to achieve definite information on matters at hand; a retentive memory on application to the task of memorizing but failing in age; plodding, industrious conservative rather than brilliant or original ways of thinking. The desire for safety, always strong, and a slow mental endowment

---

[1] Letter to Olney, March 3, 1901.

[2] Alfred Henry Lewis, Richard Croker, p. 264.

[3] American Portraits (Boston, 1922), p. 148.

[4] Henry Jones Ford, The Cleveland Era (New Haven, Conn., 1921).

enhanced the conservatism of his temperament.

After the Senate had rejected the Pacific Treaty, a friend wrote Cleveland that "you have the way of suggesting things in the critical moments which is admirable, and I am sure your political enemies are aware of your superiority of judgment."[1] His ability to analyze a situation accounts for much of his political success; it was an indispensable attribute in the campaigns for nomination and election. When he feared being pushed into place of congressman-at-large by the state convention at Syracuse in 1882, he made a flying trip to Manning at the crucial moment when the first ballot had revealed the relative strength of seekers after the nomination for governor. This act required quick analysis and decision on Cleveland's part; his ego met the needs of the immediate environment. In the 1884 campaign when the Maria Halpin episode was suddenly exposed, quick decision on Cleveland's part, his refusal to become personally involved in a scandalous controversy, showed shrewd judgment of a situation wherein Blaine blundered. His correspondence with New York friends--Goodyear, Hewitt, Bissell and others-reveals his practical analysis of the motives and actions of politicians. Accepting the political situation in New York realistically he confided to Lamont:

> It is a delusion to suppose that any professional support or actual aid by our friends will be appreciated or recognized. If Mr. Hill is defeated in the state of New York it will be said that the Cleveland or administration men did it and no matter how great their labors in the campaign and no matter how completely Mr. Hill and his friends may know of their labor.[2]

Since Mr. Hearst's motives were not so suspected in the nineties as now, Cleveland showed considerable perspicacity in refusing, at the risk of being called unpatriotic, to join a commission suggested by the New York Journal-Telegram to put up a monument to the victims of the "Maine." Said Cleveland in his diary: "I replied that I declined to aid in advertising the Journal."[3] But to Mr. Hearst he sent this telegram: "I decline to allow my sorrow for those who died on the Maine to be perverted

---

[1]Letter from Joseph P. Townsend, President of Produce and Maritime Club, New York City, August 27, 1888, Cleveland Collection.

[2]Letter of October 12, 1894.

[3]Diary, February 28, 1902.

to an advertising scheme for the New York Journal."[1] In investigating office seekers he penetrated to the heart of a situation. John W. Foster relates his advocacy of an old Harvard classmate: "The president quietly punctured my story by asking me what I knew personally of his qualifications."[2] A most interesting instance of Cleveland's analysis of a situation was his post mortem to Hedden, Collector of the Port of New York, after the Sterling-Bacon controversy was on way to being settled. Warning Hedden that "the ordinary recommendations which are presented by those seeking office are but snares and delusions," he went on to analyze the situation:

> In the Sterling matter I am prepared to believe you acted upon recommendations which you thought to be honestly given. And yet I venture to say that some of them, if not a majority, would appear upon inquiry to have been given with good natured carelessness and with no sense of the responsibility incurred. I am not at all inclined to differ with you as to the manner in which the work was being done by Mr. Bacon nor the injustice to you involved in the howl at his removal. But his removal, taken in connection with the fact that the new applicant apparently gained his place on account of his success as a local politican than for any other reason, formed a combination of circumstances which gave to the transaction a bad complexion and put you in a position which I frankly say to you should have been avoided. I honestly think you were injured by it to such an extent that it will take time and good works to regain for you a first rate place in the confidence of the people whose good opinion you desire. You would not read these words from my pen if I did not think that you would yet vindicate my action in your appointment.[3]

Some of his remarks on people show surprising analysis. After a visit from Stein on the reorganization of the B.B. and R. Railway, he said, "He is a bright young man and I expect is not doing anything for fun or for anybody's benefit but his own, but the joke is if he helps himself he must help others."[4] After a tiff with Watterson, he remarked to Carlisle, "Henry will never like me until God makes me over again."[5] He was glad that Lamont's favorable impression of Charles Murphy "agreed with that made

---

[1] Robert N. McElroy, Grover Cleveland - the Man and the Statesman (New York, 1923), II, 272.

[2] Diplomatic Memoirs (New York, 1909), II, 249.

[3] Letter to Hedden, October 14, 1885, Cleveland Collection.

[4] Letter to Bissell, September 4, 1889.

[5] Henry Watterson, Marse Henry (New York, 1919), p. 116.

upon me by a moment's chat with him a long time ago."[1] Vilas he considered "one of the most complete men--mentally, morally and politically--that I have ever met."[2] Of an agent in the Venezuelan matter he decided, "This man Scruggs is a dandy. He either has the ear of Crespo more than you think or he is a high grade liar. I am inclined to think the latter is his strong suit."[3]

Traits of Personality

The great energy accumulated by the individual, according to Freud and Adler, seeks outlet in the social environment either in normal sex behavior, undue attention to work and details, explosiveness and expansiveness socially, in humor or religion or a variety of other possible activities. Blocking of behavior in the sexual sphere, beginning with restraints on the impulses of the child, is compensated by expression in some other way in the average person. With Cleveland neither friendship, social life, drinking, humor nor religion were sufficient to take care of the enormous energies of his hearty physique. The result was extreme attention to the details of his profession and to the work involved in political leadership, sheer output of energy in his case accomplishing what genius, originality or brilliance does for other leaders.

There is no evidence of interest in girls in Cleveland's adolescence, but the puritanical atmosphere of the home environment no doubt built up inhibitions that were discharged when Cleveland settled in the freer life of Buffalo. The Maria Halpin episode with its attendant difficulties probably inhibited for a time the normal sex urge heretofore expressed by Cleveland. The truth of this affair came out during the 1884 campaign and the essential facts were these: Cleveland and several married friends visited a young widow who worked in a Buffalo store. When a son was born to her in September, 1874, she named Cleveland as the father. Not sure of his paternity, Cleveland showed little interest in the child, although he provided for his care through a friend, Roswell L. Burrows, and later the child was adopted by

---

[1]Letter to Lamont, February 18, 1904.

[2]August 14, 1886.

[3]To Olney, May 20, 1897.

strangers.[1] Reaction to this experience drew Cleveland more and more into the society of his men friends and his energies found release in accelerated attention to his profession. Formally assuming headship of his firm through the seventies, he built up his reputation at the Buffalo Bar and as a speaker at local meetings, retaining the contact with his political friends that proved valuable when a non-partisan mayor became their chief concern.

Aside from profession, his energies found some expression in social life among his men associates. He organized the Beaver Club and was a founder of the City Club in Buffalo; he and his friends were frequenters of the saloons and eating houses. Denis Tilden Lynch stresses the debauchery of those days in Buffalo.[2] Cleveland's drinking, so the psychologist would say, provided a common emotional release for underlying tensions. His decided preference for the company of men and avoidance of that of women suggested to his enemies homo-sexual tendencies which Tammany exploited at the Democratic National Convention in 1888; pamphlets entitled "The Beast of Buffalo" were circulated charging Cleveland and his friends with abnormal sex practices.[3] Cleveland's tendency to like certain people immediately, as he did Lamar and Vilas, without apparent reason, led to Lamont's remark that "Mr. Cleveland became mashed on men." And, added the Boston Transcript,

> To an extent this was true. The man whom he liked could have anything within his gift and he was utterly unwilling to believe, think or consider any report adverse to such men. Those persons who intimated any lack of approval for the men whom he looked upon with favor rarely found their advice welcome.[4]

Cleveland's friendship with Wilson Bissell, though interrupted by Cleveland's serious adjustment to an authoritarian role as executive, continued on the whole devotedly, and as recompense for misunderstanding as well as political services, Bissell was appointed Postmaster-General in the second cabinet.[5]

---

[1] Nevins, op. cit., p. 165.

[2] See Denis Tilden Lynch's Grover Cleveland: A Man Four Square (New York, 1932).

[3] Pamphlets in Cleveland Collection, Library of Congress.

[4] June 27, 1908.

[5] See letters in Cleveland Collection and Bissell Collection, especially Cleveland's letters to Charles Goodyear, who patched up the quarrel.

Cleveland's marriage to his ward, Frances Folsom, the daughter of his old friend Oscar Folsom, a girl twenty-seven years younger than himself, after he had become established in political career, reflected a paternal role. The romance of the wedding did not prevent Cleveland from considering the quality of trout streams in the neighborhood of the honeymoon cottage.[1] That marriage provided the security and stability his middle age required, Cleveland expressed in a speech before the Iroquois Club in Buffalo referring to Bissell's recent marriage: "I understand he has lately married which is something for the last five or six years I have thought a very proper thing for a man of his age, or even my age, to do."[2] Cleveland was devoted to his wife, as entries in his diary indicate, fond references to "Frank" in his letters to Bissell and Lamont. McClure relates an incident illustrative of his paternal feeling: "On March 4th, 1893 as he was about to leave the large parlor of the Arlington crowded with his many friends to go to the inaugural ceremony, he stepped up to his wife, gave her a hearty kiss and affectionately patted her on the head."[3] Charges in newspaper attacks that he beat his wife affected Cleveland deeply; the guilty feelings stirred up from his past by these charges led him to more articulation of sentiment than usual for him, as in his correspondence with friends.[4]

Cleveland's explosiveness on occasion was an interesting release of libido. Jesse Lynch Williams describes him as

> . . . . not a great talker. Once in a while something would start him going and he would run on for half an evening with reminiscences and comments on men and events--wonderful talk which ought to have been recorded even if never printed--but for the most part he let others do the talking.[5]

Cleveland's outbursts of rage accompanied by profanity indicate the same source. A special correspondent wrote to Pulitzer:

> Harrity saw Cleveland yesterday and tells me he was a sight for the gods. He had stood out in the blistering sun so long that his skin was peeling off. The operation was not exactly

---

[1]Nevins, op. cit., p. 305.

[2]Armitage, op. cit., p. 245.

[3]A. K. McClure, Our Presidents and How We Make Them (New York, 1900), p. 335.

[4]Especially letter to Bissell of June 17, 1888, Bissell Collection, Library of Congress.

[5]American Magazine, April, 1909.

> painless and he was as ugly as sin, damming all office seekers with an abundance of such expletives as you have heard from his lips before.[1]

Cleveland's favorite retort to those with whom he disagreed was, "You go to hell."

Cleveland's release of energy in humor was direct and sadistic in tone during his political days; his remarks, especially to office seekers or reporters, were reputed to be invariably sarcastic. Stealey describes one incident:

> He got off some good things himself, especially to the office seekers. One of the latter was taken one day to the White House by a congressman. It seems that he had been there several times before, but the congressman, ignorant of these visits, introduced him to Mr. Cleveland, who looked at the applicant and said, "Oh, I know Mr. _____ very well. His face is as familiar to me as the Washington Monument."[2]

When George Cortelyou applied for a position as secretary, at the outset of the interview he remarked that he was probably not the kind of stenographer wanted, since he was a Republican. Cleveland answered in his brusque way, "I want a stenographer. I have statesmen enough around me now."[3] To a young agent of the press who was instructed to secure a half column on Porto Rico, Cleveland remarked, "The Porto Rican question is too important to be discussed in a brief interview which is now rapidly drawing to a close."[4]

In striking contrast to these sarcastic outbursts is not only the increase of humor in Cleveland's utterances after his active political career but in the quality of the humor, which is genial and mild. Like the cyclothyme type of Kretschmer, Cleveland was not adverse to a joke about himself. Cleveland wrote to Olney identifying a certain Wallace MacFarlane, "I believe you sent him to Lakewood once to investigate a hair restorer."[5] When asked

---

[1]Dispatch to Pulitzer, June 6, 1893, Cleveland Collection.

[2]O. O. Stealey, Twenty Years in the Press Gallery (New York, 1906), p. 255.

[3]Statement of Cortelyou to Baltimore American, June 25, 1908.

[4]George Parker, "Grover Cleveland's Life at Princeton," Saturday Evening Post (November 10, 1923), pp. 40-48.

[5]Letter to Olney, March 8, 1894.

about his daily habits and how he spent his time at Princeton, he answered, "Well, I sit on the piazza a good deal and herd the children."[1] Cleveland's humorous references to life at Princeton suggest relief from embarrassment at his own lack of college training,and his increased indulgences in these references after retirement from active work suggest to the student of Freud a release of tension cared for before by his tremendous industry and attention to details. Writing Olney that he disliked attending a dinner in memory of William E. Russell, he added,

> Besides, the invitation is strenuously seconded by President Eliot in a personal letter and I have a deep and lasting grudge against him. I cannot help suspecting a Harvard boom whenever he appears and I am an awfully stiff and vociferous Princetonian.[2]

According to Williams, Van Dyke, Oscar Straus and others, Cleveland was "full of entertaining anecdotes--not those which go the rounds of the newspapers--and he told them with touches of excellent imitation and dialect."[3] "His stories were of real things and real episodes in his life. His humor came largely in the narration of ludicrous episodes which he had witnessed."[4] References to his favorite sport were frequent in his asides to his friends. "I hope," he wrote Olney, "that we may have diplomatic exercises with the fish in and around Buzzards Bay at times during the summer."[5] When Bryan's activities grew harassing, he wrote a genial letter to Olney saying among other things, "Bryan is still alive and his followers active, numerous and determined but is Jim Jones alive and are the bass in Long Pond numerous and in due time will they prove active and determined."[6] A few weeks after the birth of his son Richard Folsom, he commented, "The boy is beginning to look quite human."[7] Humor thus played no great part in Cleveland's

---

[1]Henry Van Dyke, "Mr. Cleveland at Princeton," Review of Reviews (August, 1908).

[2]To Olney, December 4, 1897.

[3]Van Dyke, Review of Reviews (August, 1908).

[4]Boston Transcript, June 27, 1908.

[5]Letter to Olney, June 29, 1896.

[6]Robert N. McElroy, Grover Cleveland, II, 279.

[7]Letter to Olney, December 4, 1897.

make-up as it did in Lincoln's.[1] His sarcastic outbursts provided a direct release of hate tensions against the immediate environment represented by office seekers and others who irritated him.

Neither did religion provide an emotional outlet for Cleveland's energies, for it proceeded on a conscience level (super ego) and involved habit and convention rather than emotional experience. Brought up in a Presbyterian minister's family and raised on the simple creed of the country church and the Bible, he retained a formal acquiescence in the symbols of his early environment; no intellectual doubts disturbed his literal belief in the Bible or in a personal God. He believed in keeping Sunday observance as he had been taught to do. When he was president the special delivery service was suspended on Sunday by his orders, as well as the Sunday concerts planned for his inaugural. Although pressure from the ministry contributed to these acts, they reflected, too, Cleveland's personal attitude, as well as his desire to be well thought of by conventional people.[2] When elected president he was urged to attend the First Presbyterian Church in Washington by the pastor, Reverend Mr. Sunderland, and he was regular in attendance. In the days at Princeton he seldom went to church as his diary records. Uninterested in theological differences and accustomed from his life in Buffalo to acquaintance with people of different creeds, he was tolerant toward all. His God, like that of most Americans of his generation, was an authoritarian conservative personal power. His use of the Bible and references to it provided a useful symbol of appeal to his generation; he used the Bible his mother had given him at the first inaugural; he was quoted as saying "The Bible is good enough for me."[3] Most of his religious references in speeches were of the conventional type made by all public men, revealing no personal attitude, but representing identification of right or his principles with God's will, the paternal sanction. His first letter of acceptance of nomination for president was typical of formal

---

[1]See L. Pierce Clark, Lincoln: A Psycho-Biography (New York, 1935).

[2]Letters from clergymen in Cleveland Collection, Library of Congress. Letter from D. B. Willson of Allegheny City, Penn., October 5, 1885; resolution of thanks from Presbyterian Church in Asbury, N. J.; letter from A. C. Bradley, March 2, 1893 among others.

[3]Gamaliel Bradford, American Portraits (Boston, 1922), p.150.

remarks: ". . . . with humble reliance upon the favor and support of the Supreme Being who I believe, will always bless honest human endeavor in the conscientious discharge of public duty."[1] And in the second inaugural speech, "Above all I know there is a Supreme Being who rules the affairs of men, and whose goodness and mercy have always followed the American people, and I know he will not turn from us now if we humbly and reverently seek his powerful aid." At the University of Michigan he declared, "I know that the decrees of God are never obsolete."[2]

Few religious references appear in his political opinions, but he struck out for the tariff in Biblical symbolism that must have lingered with a generation brought up in the Sunday School: "The Ten Commandments are thousands of years old; but they and the doctrine of tariff reform will be taught and preached until mankind and the Republican party shall heed the injunction, 'Thou shalt not steal.'" He said that the Sun reminded him of the sow "that returned to her wallow in the mire." But it was not the Biblical quotations, of which there were few, that gave a ministerial tone to Cleveland's speech, but the emphasis on abstract terms like honesty, fairness, duty, principles that conveys a rationalization of motives and suggests the self-righteous moralizing of his early Calvinistic upbringing.

According to Freud and others the individual may relieve tensions by thrusts against the environment, persons or objects, by sadistic outbursts against those who interfere with the immediate satisfactions, by testiness and irritability when opposed, acting on the primitive (id) level of expression. Some of Cleveland's behavior might be interpreted from this point of view.

Quick sadistic thrust to avoid injury and criticism he employed; at times he struck out, exploded energy to avoid irritation. When Ed Hawley, an old time Buffalo friend visited him in Albany, Cleveland asked, "Well, Ed, how's the wife and kids? What can I do for you?" To the response, "Not a damned thing," tne governor shot out, "The first man from Buffalo who didn't want

---

[1] Principles and Purposes of Our Form of Government (New York, 1892), p. 7.

[2] Address of Feb. 22, 1892; see Principles and Purposes of Our Form of Government, p. 169.

something."[1] Such remarks gave the governor a reputation for lack of tact. The uncovering and publication of the Maria Halpin episode in Buffalo with the aid of Reverend George Ball evoked from Cleveland no public comment, but he was not one to swallow his indignation. Imperturbably calm to the public, he wrote to Bissell in rage:

> I intend to cultivate the Christian duty of charity toward all men except the dirty class that defiled themselves with the filthy scandal of Ballism. I dont believe God will ever forgive them and I am determined not to do so.[2]

Criticisms of his personal life cut Cleveland deeply and friends witnessed the depths of his anger and sensitivity.[3]

Seldom does he show vindictiveness toward Republican opponents, but he resented the criticisms of Republican standpatters of his administration and was not above revenge in refusing to appoint one of their proteges to office. He wrote Olney regarding the candidate:

> I learn he is a good deal of a club man and what is a settler with me that his close intimates are John Hay, Henry Adams, Cabot Lodge and such. I would feel very unhappy if anyone with such associates who wish nothing but ill for the administration were connected with the State Department.[4]

Sometimes he frankly disclosed his desire to avoid anger at possible criticism, revealing worry over possible irritations in the immediate milieu. A letter accusing him of receiving funds he mentioned several times to Lamont, could not get it off his mind.

> I received at the same time [he wrote] a letter, a copy of which I enclose accusing me of stealing funds. I think this is pretty mean treatment to begin with and suspect that this is a pretty tough country. I am liable to be accused of rape before I get back.[5]

He questioned the propriety of Mrs. Cleveland presenting flags to the New York Fire Department: "The more I think of it the more I fear this will look too much like putting my wife in a place of

---

[1] Armitage, op. cit., p. 36.

[2] Letter to Bissell, November 3, 1884.

[3] Letter to Bissell, June 17, 1888; statement of Dr. Eliot of Harvard to Professor Ronald Levinson, University of Maine.

[4] Letter to Olney from Buzzards Bay, September 12, 1895.

[5] August 20, 1887.

publicity and that it may give occasion to ill natured remarks."[1] He decided against inviting Secretary Vilas and his family to Buzzards Bay for "it might cause comment or surprise on the part of other members of the cabinet."[2]

Consistent with his resentment of opposition to his ideas or satisfactions was Cleveland's dislike of Roosevelt and Bryan; he resented the prominence of these younger aspirants to political power, usurpers of his place in the environment. Convinced of his own soundness and rightness of view, he postulated charges of chauvinism, inexperience, lack of dignity, insincerity and incompetence against his rivals. His attacks on Roosevelt were almost childishly petulant and invariably unsympathetic. "There is one thing about our young president," he wrote, "which I think cannot be denied. He has but little idea of the proprieties that belong to his high office or for that matter to its incumbent."[3] Once at the St. Louis Exposition dinner where he sat next to Roosevelt he could not help reminding the younger man that "after getting through being president you've got to come back and take your place in the ranks with the rest of us."[4] The impulse to disregard tact was very strong. "How would it look for me (or for you either for that matter)," he wrote Lamont, "to go to Washington and not call on the president: And yet I should dreadfully hate to call on him."[5] After refusing to serve on the Hague Commission he wrote: "I think that the conclusions aimed at by the Hague Conference were lame and disappointing ones; I did not care to be one of the four men the majority of whom would be quite under the leadership of Mr. Harrison."[6] For Olney he analyzed McKinley's position in the war with Spain, not forgetting a dig at Roosevelt:

> The Senate will not hesitate to leave him in the lurch and Lee will strut and swagger. Roosevelt too will have his share of strut and sensation, and Miles will be commissioned general of the army.[7]

---

[1]To Lamont, August 27, 1887.

[2]To Lamont, June 3, 1886.

[3]Letter to Lamont, March 11, 1904.

[4]Jesse Lynch Williams, American Magazine, April, 1909.

[5]To Lamont, January 19, 1905.

[6]Letter to Bissell, September 16, 1900.

[7]McElroy, op. cit., II, 27.

Cleveland's resentment against Bryan was as direct and hostile as that against Roosevelt, but he rationalized his rage impulses, transmuting them into moral indignation and hatred of the policies represented by Bryan. His anatagonisms within the party he tempered by defense of superiority (moral), by assurance of the essential soundness and rightness of his own views and those of like-minded Democrats. Rather smugly he exclaimed: "The poor old Democratic party! What a spectable it presents as a tender to Bryanism and nonsense."[1] His hostility in 1896 took the form of calling names: "I am praying now that the prevalent infection may pass away leaving life and hope of recovery. In the meantime the brood of liars and fools must have their carnival."[2]

His hostility to newspapermen became a tradition of his political life, especially after the scandalous stories published in 1884 and 1888. His feelings of personal dignity and of official prestige were outraged; he never recovered a temperate attitude toward newspapermen. His exaggeration of the natural curiosity of the reporter species reveals unthinking rage. When reporters spied on his marriage in 1886 he wrote thanks to Colonel Weber who had denied knowledge of the wedding:

> Allow me to thank you personally as well as in the interest of a due regard for women and chivalry for the words attributed to you in the newspapers this morning. This is the first glimpse I have had of American manhood since the scandalous press and thoughtless people of the country began to hunt down an innocent girl as if she were a criminal.[3]

Sometimes his personal animosity to journalism underwent a substitution of public for private rights; he identified his impulses with morality and the righteous in the environment. "I am exceedingly anxious to see the dirty scoundrels in the hands of the district attorney here punished," he declared. "I think it is most important for the public service, to popular decency and to the usefulness of journalism."[4] He raged at newspaper falsifications of public policy:

---

[1]Letter to Olney, quoted by McElroy, op. cit., II, 28.

[2]Letter to L. Clarke Davis, May 14, 1896, cited in McElroy, op. cit., II, 217.

[3]Letter of April 19, 1886, quoted by Armitage, Grover Cleveland as Buffalo Knew Him, p. 217.

[4]Letter to L. Clarke Davis, June 5, 1894, Cleveland Collection.

> I read with more disgust and rage than astonishment what the World had to-day about the bond sales in the clipping you sent me from that silly sheet. I shall never forgive its malicious falsification.[1]

He complained of "lies manufactured out of whole cloth which are at this time being circulated with so much relish by the press."[2] Especially did he rail at fake stories of his fishing exploits.[3] Some of the correspondents felt the brunt of the president's hostility. Pulitzer's special correspondent hung around the White House for days in quest of an assistant postmastership and complained of being unjustly suspected of letting out news about the Russian treaty; he concluded his dispatch pathetically:

> And I fear hope of favor from his hands is gone. The publication also put other members of the administration on their guard and there is a general atmosphere of suspicion that makes it difficult to get anything from the real inside.[4]

Cleveland's verbal expression of hostile feelings formed a characteristic phase of his style, a cynical tone that few political leaders have emulated.

> It seems to me that two things are indispensable in any man who holds this office--a splendid constitution and an impervious hide. I dont see how any man could get on here without them. [Article Springfield Republican, July 15, 1885.]

> You say the friends are few and could be counted on the fingers of one hand. I am sure 5000 have claimed that they were spent on my behalf to an extent that can never be compensated. [To Bissell, June 2, 1885.]

> Suggestions to these office seekers as to the good of the country would make them faint. [Quoted by Andrew White.]

> The control of both sides of a bargain is called by a familiar and unpleasant name when found in private transactions. [Regarding the Hawaiian affair.]

> Thus influenced I wrote the letter. I am not ashamed of it and I do not desire to retract one word of it. Of course Mr. Roosevelt's use of it and the publicity he has given to a communication received in circumstances existing at the time the letter was written is a matter to be judged by the rules

---

[1] Letter to Lamont, May 7, 1904.

[2] Letter to Bissell, September 19, 1885.

[3] Clipping called "Trout Fishing" sent by J. G. Rosman as a false news story in the Standard Union, June, 1887, Cleveland Collection.

[4] Private dispatch to Joseph Pulitzer, June 9, 1893, in Cleveland Papers, Library of Congress.

> governing intercourse between gentlemen. [Concerning the coal arbitration letter to Lamont, September 22, 1904.]
>
> And so it happens that after an existence of nearly twenty years of inocuous desuetude these laws are brought forth. [Tenure of Office Battle, Principles and Purposes, p. 99.]
>
> It is apparent at a glance that the provisions of this bill are unnecessary and mischievous, besides being directly in violation of the provisions of the Constitution above referred to. And yet the bill has been printed and has presumably occupied some of the time of the committees and of the legislature. It is quite certain that the time and attention which have been devoted to the passage of this bill might well have been bestowed on measures more important and valuable. [Veto of Assembly Bill No. 142, March 16, 1883.]

Against the discharge of the hostile impulses such as Cleveland sometimes tactlessly indulged in, Freud would posit a mechanism of adjustment in the ego activities, expressions of individual desires in accordance with the forms demanded by the environment. Adler interprets the extreme self-expression of tne ego characteristics as compensation for an inferiority feeling early developed in the individual.[1] Jung suggests that ego activities are extensions of energy tensions outward upon the environment in the creation of what he terms the extrovert type of personality.[2] In view of these theories, Cleveland's energies inadequately expressed through sex, humor, religion or other activities found projection in qualities usually associated with self-expression, namely, independence, dignity, persistence, strength of conviction, strength of will, self-confidence and courage.

Cleveland's independence was often commented on. Supporters saw in it freedom from the machine and strength of conviction; critics pointed out the dangers of the omniscient illusion and conceit. "He was impatient of restraint," said one journal, "and absolutely determined to assert his own individuality, but in doing this he always commanded the respect of those who favored and of those who opposed him."[3] Another commented,

> Grover Cleveland from the first had no master, no boss. Men who enjoyed a national reputation when he was living in

---

[1]Alfred Adler, Individual Psychology (London, 1932).

[2]Carl Jung, Psychological Types (Cambridge, Mass., 1923).

[3]Article in Christian Worker, July, 1908, Clipping in Cleveland Collection.

> obscurity and who expected to dictate to him resented his independence but they soon gave up trying to overcome it.[1]

Senator Cullom observed that as chief executive "he was strong minded and forceful and adhered to his own views on public questions with a remarkable degree of tenacity utterly regardless of his party."[2]

Cleveland's own words bear out these impressions of innate independence. To a gentleman who advised him to have nothing to do with an anti-free silver meeting in New York and to write no letter, Cleveland replied:

> It is said that I ought not to go there nor to write a letter of any sort on this matter of extreme importance because it might embarrass my nomination. I am going to write a letter to be read at that meeting and the presidency can go to hell.[3]

And in the midst of the 1884 campaign, when conciliation of Tammany seemed necessary for his success, he wrote Lamont:

> Now this is for you privately. I would rather be beaten in this race than truckle to B-- and Kelly, I dont want any pledge made for me that will violate my professions and betray and deceive the good people who believe in me. Of course I appreciate my relations with the party and the advice on the part of good men to win at any price. But I cannot forget that a stiff upper lip may be the best means of bringing about united action.[4]

When this undoubted feeling of independence on his part was widely known, public identification with him was facilitated by the tradition of rugged individualism.

Cleveland's independence constantly cropped out in his relations with others in office and was made the subject of much criticism, much of it adverse. It was asserted that

> . . . . he was constantly in hot water with members of his official family because his policies were always paramount. If he agreed with Secretary Manning, Secretary Bayard, Secretary Endicott or Secretary Whitney, he adopted their advice. But on the other hand if he disagreed with them his views always prevailed.[5]

---

[1] Chicago Record-Herald, undated clipping in Cleveland Collection.

[2] Shelby Cullom, Fifty Years of Public Service (Chicago, 1911), p. 225.

[3] Statement of Francis Lynde Stetson to Philadelphia Press, June 25, 1908.

[4] Letter to Lamont from Saranac, August 11, 1884.

[5] Buffalo Times, June 27, 1908.

enry Watterson remarked acidly that although Cleveland had a reat desire to serve the country "he was apt to think that he lone could actively serve it."[1] Tilden spoke of him as "the kind of man who would rather do something badly for himself than to have somebody else do it well."[2] His independence of Cabinet advice provided many stories for wits of the Senate. Vice-President Adlai Stevenson told one about President Buchanan consulting Vice-president Breckinridge on his Thanksgiving Proclamation. Senator Gorman turned to Stevenson and asked, "Has Mr. Cleveland yet consulted you to that extent, Mr. Vice-president?" With a twinkle in his eye, "Uncle Adlai" promptly replied, "Not yet, but there are still a few weeks of my term remaining."[3]

Stealey, a congressional reporter for many years, referred to Cleveland as "aggressive, self-willed, dominating. He listened to the views of cabinet officers on various administrative questions and then exercised his own sweet will regardless of their opinions."[4] His preference for arriving at decisions independently was recognized by his close associates. J. N. Matthews, an old friend of Buffalo, expressed this view in a letter regarding the pardon of one Baker, an alleged bigamist:

> His friends here have been very anxious and very restive, but I told them I was sure you would go into his case as soon as possible and decide it on an independent judgment inclined to mercy. I was sure and said so that no urgency on my part would do the slightest good so I declined to urge you.[5]

Edward Curtis, who resented being referred to in the press as a Californian who had influence with the President, remarked ruefully on his efforts for a year "to get a man appointed to something" and concluded ironically, "Oh, yes, I have great influence with the President."[6] Such was the general sentiment of cabinet

---

[1]Watterson, Marse Henry, p. 144.

[2]George Parker, Recollections of Grover Cleveland (New York, 1911), p. 34.

[3]David Barry, Forty Years in Washington (Boston, 1924), p. 191.

[4]O. O. Stealey, Twenty Years in the Press Gallery, p. 28.

[5]Letter to Cleveland dated September 19, 1883, Cleveland Collection.

[6]Letter from Curtis in Cleveland Collection, April 11, 1887.

officers, appointees and friends of Cleveland, whose independence and self-assertion were impressive qualities.

To independence Cleveland added silence about his affairs, sometimes extending to his most intimate advisers. Cooley speaks of the social power of silence as

> . . . . another instance of the prestige of the inscrutable when power is imagined to lie behind it. One who appears to be his own master and does not too readily reveal his deeper feelings is so much more likely to create an impression of power.

Even Lamont did not always know Cleveland's decisions. "There are many things in which the president does not even take Lamont into his confidence," said one shrewd newspaperman,

> In such cases it is hard to get an admission of this out of the colonel. It is his role to play the omniscient and for purposes of the White House to have known all that was coming. Occasionally, however, the sharp observer will startle an acknowledgment out of Lamont, getting a glimpse of the fact that he knew almost nothing of what was coming.[1]

How true this surmise was is indicated by Lamont's comment to Cleveland when he read Cleveland's letter to Kelly asking Grady's removal, which Kelly had given to the papers, "Well, governor, I see they've been springing a forgery on you."[2] The Venezuelan message had been prepared in the summer at Buzzards Bay by Cleveland and Olney.

> The note [said Secretary Herbert] was submitted to every cabinet member. All the Cabinet knew for three or four months before Congress convened that this bombshell had been prepared. Nevertheless,it was kept absolutely secret. As Mr. Cleveland himself said, he did not believe in doing public business on the sidewalk.[3]

Webb cites persistence as the most general character factor in the make-up of the individual; in a sense persistence in action is character. It rests on the motivation of conviction in pursuit of a policy or aim. According to Roback "character emanates from the individual himself and transcends the community and presents as objective problem; it is living up to one's conviction in spite of social pressure."[4] Cleveland's ego

---

[1]"Peculiarities of Mr. Cleveland," Boston Advertiser, clipping in Cleveland Collection.

[2]Buffalo Express, June 25, 1908.

[3]Chicago Journal, June 24, 1908.

[4]A. A. Roback, Psychology of Character with a Study of Temperament (New York, 1927), p. 347.

expression took form in various situations as strength of conviction, and persistence in these convictions to the point of obstinacy with domineering will and self-confidence. With moral-reproachful tone he places judgment on the behavior of friends and party associates, so confident is he of right. He is at home in the milieu of practical affairs; he posits no escape mechanism, but asserts his own feelings and convictions in spite of opposition.

His strength of conviction and persistence greatly impressed his contemporaries. Chauncey Depew declared that "if he had once made up his mind and believed he was right no questions of expediency or popularity had any influence on him."[1] He was considered "rugged, imperious, self-confident and at times self-righteous";[2] "unyielding and inflexible for what he believed to be the right." "He was firm almost to obstinacy," was one verdict;[3] "he was solid and steadfast and immovable" was another.[4] "He was deliberate in action, firm in conviction and willing to accept responsibility for what he did," said Bryan.[5] "He was dogmatic and unchangeable in opinion" one editor found.[6] "He was firm sometimes to the verge of obstinacy," stated Colonel Weber, a Buffalo friend.[7]

Cleveland's convictions permeate the whole fabric of his political career. They were conservative convictions, and Cleveland shows his greatest persistence in fighting for what seems to him fundamental and "right" (constitutional, legal) with the weight of tradition and vested interest. He does not promulgate or look with favor on new or radical proposals; he defends established precedent and authority. We find this true in his defense of the original Democratic tariff for revenue only, in his fight for sound money and the bond issue, in his trouble with the Chicago strikers and Governor Altgeld, in his defense of the

---

[1] My Memories of Eighty Years (New York, 1922), p. 124.

[2] Philadelphia Inquirer, June 25, 1908.

[3] Pittsburgh Dispatch, June 25, 1908.

[4] Current Literature, August, 1908.

[5] Statement made at time of Cleveland's death, June 24, 1908.

[6] Oklahoma State Capital, clipping, Cleveland Collection.

[7] Armitage, op. cit., p. 218.

Treasury against the pension seekers. Wolfe interprets conservatism as a safety first attitude, its root in desire for security, in deep seated attachment for things as they are; it constitutes not only habit or idea but a value (conviction, moral). In the conservative temperament, according to Wolfe, excessive pride and egotism enter in, conceit in consistency.[1]

Cleveland's behavior at the time of the issuance of the gold bonds illustrates his adherence to a course of action once determined by him as constitutional, hence right. When J. P. Morgan, remembering an act of 1862 that allowed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase gold first called on Cleveland, he discovered, according to Mr. Morgan's biographer

> . . . . between them there existed a profound difference of opinion. Mr. Cleveland was not a man to be carried off his feet by the personal force of another; he had made up his mind he would leave the matter to Congress and he would not change.[2]

He found satisfaction, too, in sticking to his conservative decisions and expressed sadistic pleasure at the discomfiture of Democrats who had strayed off with Bryanism. "I have some conviction that the party may before long become purged of Bryanism, and the rank and file surprised at their wanderings and enraged at their false leaders will be anxious to return to their old faith and in their desire to re-organize under the old banners will welcome the counsel of those who never yielded to disastrous heresy." Even if this did not happen, he concluded in the same self-satisfied strain, "it is worth all to be conscious at all times that we have been consistently and patriotically Democratic."[3] At the time of his victory in 1884 Cleveland easily associated his election with the triumph of right: "As I look over the field I see some people lying dead whose demise will not harm the country, some whose wounds will perhaps serve to teach them that honesty and decency are worth pursuing, and some whose fidelity and stanch devotion are rewarded with victory."[4] He and his

---

[1] A. B. Wolfe, Conservatism, Radicalism and Scientific Method (New York, 1923), chap. iv.

[2] Hovey, Life Story of J. Pierpont Morgan, p. 182.

[3] Letter to Bissell, September 16, 1900.

[4] Letter to Bissell, November 13, 1884, quoted by Nevins, op. cit., p. 190.

followers, Cleveland was convinced, were repositories of the good within the Democratic party, a belief only strengthened by the advent of Hill, and he not only felt it but said it. "Such men as you and I and the thousands of good Democrats," he told Bissell, "who believe the principles of our party mean the good of the people and honesty and fidelity in public places cannot afford to be traded off and misrepresented by those who are in politics for what may be made out of it; and it is a disgrace for us to allow ourselves to be used to further their purposes."[1] He was willing, he confided, "to subordinate all things except honor and consistency to the good of the party if rightly guided,"[2] and when wrongly guided, or by others than himself, he expressed pleasure at the disillusionment of Democrats with Bryanism.[3]

His stubborn conviction of right brought adverse criticism and complications in group conciliation within the party. Upon his refusal to sanction Edward Murphy for senator, one of the committee petulantly remarked, "If you attempt to stand above your party, you will find yourself in the cold before you are through with it." Cleveland's answer was of the type that infuriated his political associates as well as his enemies, "Yes, people who occupy high altitudes are often in the cold." Henry Watterson, whose own ego could ill withstand a stronger personality, declared that

> Mr. Cleveland grew churlish his second term in the White House, exceedingly high and mighty, suggesting somewhat the stuffed prophet of Mr. Dana's relentless lambasting and verifying my insistence that he posed rather as an idol to be worshipped than a leader to be trusted and loved. He was, in truth, a strong man, sufficiently mindful of his limitations in the beginning, grew by unexampled success over-confident and over-conscious in his own conceit.[4]

How much of a self portrait Watterson drew must be left to Watterson's biographer.

Cleveland's feelings of confidence appear to have maintained an even course of expression; he was not moody or melancholic, nor did he experience the elation--expansive impulses of

---

[1]Letter to Bissell from Buzzards Bay, June 30, 1891.

[2]Letter to Lamont, September 30, 1883.

[3]Letter to Olney, June 25, 1900.

[4]Watterson, op. cit, II, 143.

Bryan. Very seldom does he strike off a spark that reveals the burning intensity of his self-confidence. Once during the Sterling-Bacon case, he confided to Bissell, he had been very much worried but "it looks now as though with my usual luck I was to wiggle out of it all right and turn the whole thing to profit."[1] In his early relations with the Senate, he expressed an exaggerated sense of security:

> Things are now very well. I think the Senate if discreetly treated will do better than many suppose. There hasn't been a time since I came here that I have stood stronger and had the people so nearly with me as now.[2]

Such expansive moods, however, were not common. His self-confidence and conviction of right were usually firmer expression of deep seated ego impulses.

Cleveland's self-assertion or ego took the form of courage in certain situations where his adherence to a line of action involved danger to his policies or success. Contemporaries conceded that he possessed courage to a high degree. Chauncey Depew refers to his courage "of the General Jackson type."[3] William Howard Taft spoke of "his rugged honesty and high courage" as did Charles Evans Hughes, Hoke Smith and Judge Gray of Delaware. Olney referred to "his lofty convictions of public duty and the courage necessary to put them into effect." After the tariff struggle the Nation lauded Cleveland's "splendid courage in the defense of honestly formed opinions, of Roman constancy under defeat."[4]

Cleveland's environment placed no premium on physical courage, although there is sufficient evidence to indicate that he possessed it. Various reasons combined to prevent his enlisting in the Civil War[5] and hiring a substitute was a common practice, not connoting cowardice. Several biographers repeat the story of his fight with Mike Falvey in the streets of Buffalo, with the Irishman the loser. The New York Herald reported an assault on Cleveland when governor by one Samuel Boone, whose brother-in-law

---

[1] Letter, September 25, 1885, Cleveland Collection.

[2] Letter to Bissell, December 14, 1885.

[3] My Memories of Eighty Years, p. 124.

[4] The Nation, editorial, November 10, 1892.

[5] See supra, chap. i. (This refers to the complete dissertation, which is to be found only in the University of Chicago Libraries.)

the governor had refused to pardon. Meeting Cleveland on the street,

> . . . . the individual immediately put himself in fighting attitude and with clenched fists struck savagely at Governor Cleveland, hit him on the left side of the head near the ear. As the man delivered the blow he shouted, "You have killed my wife."

As Cleveland proceeded on his way without concern, Boone was intercepted by Dr. Houghton. The governor did not mention the assault when he arrived at the office, seeming to think it of no consequence.[1]

It was attack on his principles that injured Cleveland's ego, and his courage depended on his strength of conviction and stubborn self-confidence. What seemed to him inevitable courses of action once he had decided upon them--veto of pension bills, civil service reform, tariff reform, opposition to free silver--came to represent to certain groups of citizens courageous behavior or foolhardiness or stubborn conservatism depending on their point of view. If courage consists in staking political success on bold decision and definite policy, Cleveland certainly exhibited that quality. His political associates knew he would stand by a course of action once determined upon, despite the dangers. A. E. Orr lamented when he heard of Cleveland's proposed letter endorsing Hill. "I beg you, most earnestly beg you," he wrote Dan Magone, "to prevent his doing so. You know how thoroughly I believe in him because he has the courage at all times to live up to the dead level of his convictions and no one can be asked or expected to do more."[2] Newspapermen, in conjecturing what the president might next propose, conceded courage to him in regard to any policy.

> That is an interesting report from Washington to the effect that the President is expected at an early day to send a special message to Congress on the subject of civil service reform. Everyone knows that if Mr. Cleveland breaks out once on this topic in his present apparent humor he will have something to say worth reading. If there is one trait of the president's character more conspicious than another it is his courage and persistence in the face of obstacles.[3]

---

[1] New York Herald, October 21, 1888.

[2] Letter in Cleveland Collection.

[3] Evening Telegram, Bridgeton, New Jersey, clipping in Cleveland Collection.

Cleveland's tariff message of 1887,issued against the advice of party leaders,illustrates his courage in standing by his own policies, the strength of his self-assertiveness. How much that courage was aggravated by the opposition of rivals like Gorman and Randall, how much augmented by a desire for approbation from like-minded Democrats, it is difficult to say. George Hoadley wanted him to "go slow" on revision of the tariff, that he "had both the manufacturers and Knights of Labor to be afraid of."[1] Colonel A. K. McClure, when he saw the draft of the message, begged Cleveland to change it; it would, he was certain, defeat the president at the next election.[2] Neither did he listen to cautious advice about his silver policy. When the Iroquois Club in Chicago invited him to speak on silver, he wrote Olney:

> They have urged me to attend and speak and it does not seem to me I ought to refuse. How can I profess to be a believer in sound money and sound democracy and still be constantly running away when such believers propose to stand up and be counted. I have substantially agreed to attend. I cannot bring myself to talk that kind of harmony which is a genteel name for a cowardly abandonment of conscience and conviction and yet I fully appreciate the volume of abuse likely to be aroused if another course is pursued.

In the complex manifestations of personality Freud posits a third type of behavior on the super-ego or conscience level. The individual rationalizes his selfish or ego impulses in terms of the morality valued by the environment, in action or verbal utterance that places the behavior on a moral-superior basis most highly acceptable to others. Such behavior arouses in others identification with what they conceive as unselfish and moral purposes, producing a satisfaction and compensation for hostile or ego impulses. It would seem that developed behavior on this level would be necessary to the political leader for survival in any society, and especially in the moralizing environment of Victorian America.

Cleveland's great expenditure of energy in practical work was easily rationalized as devotion to duty and sense of responsibility to the demands of office once he entered public life. The social approbation received in our culture for mere expenditure of energy served to relieve the anxieties created by "fear of loss

---

[1] Nevins, op. cit., p. 376.

[2] McClure, Recollections of Half a Century, cited by Nevins, op. cit., p. 376.

of prestige through a blunder or vicious indulgence."[1] After the early difficulties in Buffalo, Cleveland distinguished himself by renewed devotion to his profession and later to the duties of political office. This concentration, almost pathological, was often remarked by his associates. Williams declared he was one of the hardest toiling presidents we ever had working for us. From nine in the morning until two at night were his regular working hours, but many a time he was still at his desk working his way painstakingly through a mass of papers when the rising sun looked in through the windows of the East Room. Andrew White learned from Cleveland's secretaries that "he insisted on writing out all important papers and conducting his correspondence in his own hand and the result was that during a considerable period of congressional sessions he sat at his desk until three in the morning." Clark cites an instance of Cleveland's reading fifty pages of legal cap for one appointment.[2] On occasions like the Walker retiring case or the Sterling-Bacon controversy he read every paper involved.[3] Unfortunately for later investigators of his papers he wrote out all messages, letters and articles. This inability to delegate work suggests compulsive behavior, need to expend energy even on trivial matters. Proof of this is found in his correspondence, letters to individuals that were certainly a waste of time on the part of the President. Stealey criticized Cleveland for wasting his time on private pension bills.[4] Even his vacations were not free from the compulsion to work; he felt a twinge of guilt when he was not busy. "I have risen early in the morning according to custom," he wrote Lamont from Pittsburgh. "I am writing this before breakfast. I merely speak of these things to show you that though on pleasure I am bent, I shall

---

[1]Edward Kempf, "Autonomic Functions and the Personality," Nervous and Mental Diseases Monographs (Series 28; New York, 1918); see also Kempf's Psychopathology (St. Louis, 1921), p. 139.

[2]My Quarter Century of American Politics, I, 259-60, appointment made by Senator Vest.

[3]Letter from Cleveland to Lamont, December 4, 1895, Cleveland Collection.

[4]For example, a letter to Sibley and Holmwood dated November, 1884, in which he thanked them for a "huge stick of candy just received. It was an object of great curiosity to my friends as well as a source of gratification to all who have been permitted to taste it."

tinge the trip with a spice of industry and early rising."[1] Twelve years later he wrote Olney in the same strain.[2]

His use of the word "duty" suggests from the viewpoint of Freud deep inner stresses placed on a conscience level; it is repeated often in his correspondence. In a letter upholding his removal of Baker from the Baltimore customs, he concluded, "Above all, let us constantly be reminded that the good of the people, the protection of their interests is the supreme duty of all public officers."[3] When elected governor he told his brother that he intended to make the matter "a business engagement between the people and myself in which the obligation on my side is to perform the duties assigned me."[4] When elected president, he told Bissell that he had only "a hope that I may be of service to my people."[5] Regarding the removal of a postmaster at Rome, New York, he wrote Secretary Vilas: "It clearly seems to be my duty to exercise prompt action in this case to vindicate the laws which have been enacted for the regulation of the postal service and to impress upon federal office holders the fact that no indulgence will be granted by the executive to those who violate the law or neglect public duty."[6] After the 1888 nomination he declared that "in being a candidate again I am but answering the demands of public and political duty."[7] The break with earlier associates who expected political preferment he rationalized on the basis of public duty, saying rather bluntly, "Public duty may sometimes stand in the way of personal friendship."[8] The extreme expression of this feeling was probably in the letter to Bissell confiding his troubles with office seeking friends:

---

[1]Letter of August 8, 1884.

[2]Letter to Olney, December 13, 1896.

[3]Letter to E. W. Ross of Baltimore G.A.R. who wrote protesting removal of Baker, Cleveland Collection.

[4]De Alva Stanwood Alexander, Four Famous New Yorkers, p. 117.

[5]Letter of November 13, 1884, Cleveland Collection.

[6]Letter to Vilas dated April 4, 1885, Cleveland Collection.

[7]June 17, 1888.

[8]Dinner in Buffalo, May 11, 1891.

> I have never though how solemn a thing it is to live and feel the purpose of the duties which life--the mere existence in a social state impose, but I have never appreciated the thought in its full solemnity till now. It seems to me I am as much consecrated to service as a religionist who secludes himself from all that is joyous in life and devotes himself to a sacred mission.[1]

Like his exaggerated sense of duty, Cleveland's emphasis on honesty in public office indicates a compulsive behavior or expression on the level of conscience. This compensation of hostile impulses on the super ego level seems to have been developed in Cleveland's childhood. Williams tells a story of his obsession with honesty as a child.

> He could hardly have been more than four or five years old when one day he was found crying bitterly because a peddler who had visited the house had dropped a pair of suspenders and was now too far down the road for the little fellow to catch him and return them. The story of the neighborly hen who persisted in laying eggs in the Reverend Mr. Cleveland's yard has already been told. The boy Grover soberly carried them back to the neighbor's house each day and finally made such a fuss about it he had to be suppressed.[2]

The story is told, too, that he refused to treat his fellow clerks out of the merchandise of his employer, as was the custom in Fayetteville when he worked in the store of Deacon Vicars.[3]

His references to honesty in his own utterances are extensive. In the letter accepting the nomination for president in 1884 he emphasized administering the government in "the honest simple and plain manner which is consistent with its character and purpose."[4] In the Ann Arbor address he referred to "the ideals which constitute a sentiment underlying our national structure" as "the exaction of civic virtue and honesty."[5] In a speech at Providence he plead: "Let us then appreciate the fact that we not only stand upon sure and safe ground when we appeal to honesty and morality in our championing the interest of the masses of our people as they are related to tariff taxation."[6] He appealed to

---

[1] McElroy, op. cit., I, 47-48.

[2] Jesse Lynch Williams, American Magazine, April, 1909.

[3] Nevins, p. 20.

[4] Speech August 18, 1884; see Principles and Purposes of Our Form of Government, p. 3.

[5] Ann Arbor Address, February 22, 1892.

[6] Speech at Providence, Rhode Island, April 2, 1892.

"those who believe that a nation in boasting that its foundation is honesty and conscience cannot afford to discard moral sentiment."[1] And added, "our consumers are entitled to be treated justly and honestly by the government."[2] Against fraudulent claims in the pension bills he interposed the theme of honesty in government dealings. In the annual message to Congress in 1885 he said of the pension bills: "While there is no expenditure of the public funds which the people more cheerfully approve than that made in recognition of the services of our soldiers, living or dead, the sentiment underlying the subject should not be vitiated by the introduction of any fraudulent practice."[3] Vetoing some private pension bills he spoke scorchingly of "the effrontery of this father renewing his claim after the detection of his fraud"[4] and of"the freedom with which the private pension bills are passed furnish an inducement to fraud and imposition while it actually teaches the vicious lesson to our people that the Treasury of the national government invites the approach of private need."[5]

The term honesty is often referred to Cleveland by men who knew him, although he resented the imputation that he was remarkably honest in carrying out the duties of office as he saw them. Some said "he was honest and fearless to duty,"[6] that he possessed "honesty and purpose for good,"[7] "uncompromising honesty,"[8] "rugged honesty of purpose and determination."[9] His outspokenness on public problems and reiteration of idea of honesty aided the universal impression of honesty. "One cannot read the president's inaugural,"said a trade journal, "without being impressed with

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Annual Message, 1885, Principles and Purposes, p. 66.

[4] Veto pension bill for John Reed, February 9, 1887.

[5] Veto of pension for Mary Ann Daughtery, July 5, 1888.

[6] Evening Telegram, June 25, 1908.

[7] Speech at G.A.R. meeting, printed in San Diego Union, June 15, 1908.

[8] Milwaukee Free Press, editorial, June 29, 1908.

[9] Oscar Straus, op. cit., p. 110.

the honesty of its statements."[1]

Sincerity was imputed to him, too, through the impression of his devotion to duty, his courage in standing up for certain policies.

> He did many things [said the World] that were certain to cost him votes in any subsequent candidacy he might enter upon. He did them with a sense of duty and with a courage and devotion truly admirable. He made mistakes, too, but they were mistakes of a sincere mind.[2]

Richard Watson Gilder assured a friend, "You would, I am sure, sympathize still more with my sense of his sincerity and the disinterestedness of his aims."[3] The Herald compared his sincerity to Lincoln's: "Like Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Cleveland in his writing shows perfect sincerity. This atmosphere of absolute honesty strengthens and illuminates his style."[4]

The very continuation of an individual in public office bespeaks a certain number of the public impressed with his honesty and sincerity; people never admittedly vote for crooks or liars. What to many may seem dishonesty, as in the case of Blaine, will to the leader's followers be innocent misguidance or misrepresentation by enemies. Cleveland's charge to his managers "Tell them the truth" in his first campaign set an impression of his honesty and sincerity in the public mind that was politically profitable for many years: The contrast with Blaine's unfortunate Mulligan letters was decidedly apropos. With sincerity, too, reputation for fairness and justice aids the political leader. There was some ground for this popular belief, as Cleveland's correspondence shows. He was anxious that no injustice be done men in the employ of the government. An example is his letter to Olney concerning the removal of one Barclay, consul at Tangiers. He wrote,

> Can it be possible that, with the satisfactory exhibit of wrong doing presented to us we have done this man injustice? At any rate I think it will be well to make a note of the men he mentions in his letter as having conspired against him to the end that they shall not profit by such a course if

---

[1] American Grocer, March 8, 1893.

[2] Quoted by John L. Heaton, The Story of a Page (New York, 1913), p. 92.

[3] Letters of Richard Watson Gilder (Boston, 1916), p. 159.

[4] September 10, 1888, comments on Cleveland's speech of acceptance.

they have entered upon it.[1]

The question of Cleveland's loyalty to his friends was fought out in the journals of the country during his early years of office holding. The Sun declared that "he has no friends" and there is "lack of personal friendship between the president and the members of his party." Another journal declared that "Mr. Cleveland is by nature not only a conservative but rather a cold and reserved man, at least he is so regarded by many of his friends."[2] Contrast Chauncey Depew's statement as an example of many made by friends, "In personal intercourse he made friends and had great charm."[3] Cleveland's correspondence bears out the fact of Cleveland's wide range of friendship with various types of men. The superior role he assumed in office precluded the geniality of a Taft or the hail-fellow-well-met spirit of a Harding but it probably added to the impression of dignity, aloofness and power associated with loneliness in high office.

Some of the newspapers declared that Cleveland was "gruff and unsympathetic," that he had no sympathy for the veterans, that he went fishing on the day of Vice-President Hendrick's funeral, that he was unkind to his wife and her mother. Just how important a reputation for kindness is in political life is debatable, despite the stereotype of the baby-kissing politician. Is it because of the longing for the father--authority who will shoulder responsibility and whose features assume the sternness and dignity of the disciplinarian that less emphasis is placed on personal kindness and sympathy in the public mind? Was Cleveland's consideration for Mrs. Grant at the general's death real sympathy or a desire to do the conventionally right thing? At any rate, his public proclamation and his letters to Mrs. Grant were well received publicly.[4] A regard for due expression of sympathy in face of loss led him to correct Olney's message to Queen Victoria; Cleveland thought it should be softened a little.[5] In his personal

---

[1]Letter to Olney, Buzzards Bay, August 2, 1896, Olney Collection.

[2]Freeman's Journal, September 15, 1892.

[3]My Memories of Eighty Years, p. 12.

[4]Letter from H. A. Richmond, Buffalo, July 27, 1885, Cleveland Collection.

[5]Letter to Olney, March 16, 1896.

life the matter is somewhat plainer for he records kindness done friends, servants and children in his diary and letters. The case of Mrs. Mayhew to whom the Department of the Interior owed three hundred dollars aroused his sympathy and he urged it to the official in charge of claims;[1] another letter thanks him for securing a position for a blind girl, Alice Murray, in the Department of Agriculture.[2] Such personal acts as these, found in the experience of all our presidents, seldom become known publicly.

Cleveland's verbal expression on the conscience level took the form of generalization and platitude. These abound in his speeches and letters, providing a contrast to the factuality of some of his speeches to Congress based on yearly reports of the executive departments. These platitudes characterize his entire output of writings, indicating deep seated inclination on his part to generalize impulses, even if we discount the penchant of his generation for moral abstractions fostered by school days spent in studying McGuffy's Readers. Here are some examples:

> Office holders are the agents of the people, not the masters.
>
> It is not the slothful acceptance of righteous political ideas but the call to action for their application and enforcement that tests the endurance and moral courage of men.
>
> Our progress toward a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much of bandying epithets. It is a condition which confronts us, not a theory.
>
> Principles enduring because they are right and invincible because they are just.
>
> The complete supremacy of Democratic principles means increased national prosperity and the increased happiness of our people.
>
> In all circumstances you and I can boast of being residents of the greatest cities our countries can boast, of being citizens of the greatest land on Earth, and on belonging to a party which seeks to protect the rights and further the prosperity of the American people.

If we examine Cleveland's behavior with attention to the actions and verbal utterances expressing moral superiority or unselfishness, we find great stress laid on duty, and honesty, with some less concern with sincerity, loyalty, kindness and other popular virtues. He exalts duty and service to the moral-religious

---

[1]Letter to Honorable Joseph S. Miller, March 3, 1888.

[2]Letter from I. A. Walter, Pastor St. Patrick's Church, Washington, D. C.

sphere; he speaks of them in consecrated tones; he thus identifies himself with the righteous forces of the community. How powerful this type of behavior proved to be for Cleveland we shall indicate in following chapters.

In accordance with the work of Freud, Adler, Jung, Alexander and others, Professor Lasswell in his work on political-pathological individuals has suggested certain types of behavior found common to administrators. The case of "K" cited by Professor Lasswell bears some similarity to Cleveland's in conscientious, overscrupulous devotion to work, "fondness for detail and delight in routine."[1] Early hardships and financial difficulties played a great part in "K's" life as in Cleveland's and a feeling of inadequacy developed in the sexual sphere; too, both possessed very powerful aggressive drives. The traits of Cleveland already discussed suggest that he represents one of that group of administrators described by Professor Lasswell as having

> . . . . passed smoothly through their developmental crisis. They have not over-repressed powerful hostilities, but either sublimated these drives, or expressed them boldly in the intimate circle. They display an impersonal interest in the task of organization itself, and assert themselves with firmness, though not with over emphasis, in professional and in intimate life.[2]

Although the works of Freud, Kretschmer, Kempf and others suggest possible interpretations of Cleveland's behavior in terms of traits and their pyschic basis, a more objective approach is necessary to evaluate Cleveland's aptitude as a political leader. In the absence of scientific measurement of personality traits, Professor Merriam's suggested category of aptitudes found in a variety of leaders should prove fruitful of application.[3] These distinctive qualities of the political leader are:

1. A high degree of social sensitivity.
2. Facility in personal contacts.
3. Facility in group contacts and in harmonizing group interests.
4. Dramatic expression.

---

[1]See Psychopathology and Politics (Chicago, 1930), p. 142.

[2]Ibid., p. 151.

[3]Charles Edward Merriam, Political Power (New York, 1935), p. 40; see also The American Party System (New York, 1922), pp. 47-48; Four American Party Leaders (New York, 1926).

5. Facility of invention.

6. A high degree of courage.

Let us see how Cleveland measures up to these leadership qualifications.

In the broad connotation of the term Cleveland lacked social sensitivity. The problems of the West and South, of tne farmer and laborer, he neither understood nor investigated; his knowledge was narrowly legal and his imagination undeveloped. In the end this deficiency proved fatal to his leadership of the party as the events of his second term and of 1896 proved. By then the economic difficulties of the farmers that bred the currency issue could no longer be disregarded. But during the eighties it may be posited that this lack of social sensitiveness to economic undercurrents was an advantage to Cleveland's success, his narrow vision limiting him to expression on problems more immediately at hand like the government surplus and civil service reform, which offered no disturbance to business or to the Eastern financial classes, and thus postponed the evil day of mass protest. That the broader social sensitiveness in a society dominated by these interests was not exactly a step to political success was aptly illustrated by the failure of Henry George and William Jennings Bryan. Cleveland was sensitive to the demands of the immediate environment, which above all required a leadership that would be stable and reassuring. Lack of the humanitarian's fine sensitivity to the hardships and injustices of society and to concern for a possible remedy eliminates Cleveland from the company of Jefferson, Lincoln and Bryan.

We have indicated that Cleveland was a good judge of men, his ability to draw about him the most useful and astute politicians of the Democratic party being evidence of his skill in personal contacts. Part of his ability here derived from the virtue of his limitations. Blaine's many-sided volatile personality antagonized party leaders, who he thought were less able managers, administrators, statesmen, orators and publicists than himself. With Cleveland the division of labor worked admirably. The blase dynamic Whitney, the shrewd attractive Gorman, the suave wire-pulling Lamont supplemented needs in Cleveland's own nature which he had the sense to recognize. While he generalized on civil service reform, Whitney and Lamont dispensed the patronage; while he expressed hatred of all journalists, Lamont and Parker kept the

wires open to the White House. Lugubrious and unliterary himself, he could appreciate the qualities and win the affection of such diverse personalities as Joe Jefferson, Richard Watson Gilder, Oscar Straus, George F. Parker, John Boyle O'Reilly, Carl Schurz, Professor West and Dr. Finley. When the individual contact offered no challenge to his dignity or executive prestige, Cleveland was particularly successful as in relations with his Cabinet and with the administration leaders in Congress like Wilson and Crisp. To the important Independent Republicans he pointed the goal to civil service reform, winning individual leaders like Carl Schurz, Godkin, Offendorfer, Henry Ward Beecher and Villard. Despite partisan charges that he alienated friends and showed ingratitude, the evidence suggests that Cleveland possessed facility in personal contacts to a high degree.

Cleveland naturally sympathized with the Germans and business groups, as we have indicated; the Irish and labor groups he wisely left to his managers. As an outsider in politics, early in his career he expressed the alliance of all groups opposed to corruption and inefficiency in government, winning Germans, business men, Independent Republicans, reformers and journalists. His availability to various groups marked his initial success in Buffalo and he and his managers developed these appeals in the national contests. His ability to judge a situation proved a useful trait in the welter of New York politics, for it made him wary of Tammany agreements and cynical of the ways of politicians like David B. Hill and Butler; he developed a realistic approach to party groups necessary for his political survival. Although certainly not endowed with prophecy, his ability to size up a situation enabled him to act in crises with dramatic appeal to certain groups. Too, his facility at expression of group interests in terms of "tax payer," "the American citizen," "the public," pleased all groups who felt they belonged in said category. With Congress as a group which questioned his executive authority, he was unsuccessful, alienating even the Democrats. But his appeal over the legislators to the larger group of the electorate reveals astute group harmonizing. It may be concluded that Cleveland was only partially successful in individual group contacts, but by refusing at times to recognize the existence of special group interests he covered up this defect with wider popular appeals.

Lacking the imagination that stultifies a Hamlet's will,

Cleveland's serious attacks on immediate problems provided a most important dramatic expression to his whole career. This very essence of drama, conflict, is reflected in his fights with the city council of Buffalo, with the New York legislature, with Tammany Hall and with David S. Hill, with Congress and the Senate, with Blaine and Harrison, with Republican tariff and Republican corruption, with Great Britain and with disturbers of the public service in Illinois. He excelled in simplifying issues so that the bare elements of the conflict emerged--the simple reformer vs. Tammany intrigue, corruption vs. civil service, tariff reform vs. greed, American sovereignty vs. British aggression, the dignity of the peoples' representative vs. a spiteful Senate. His verbal expression, impressive and platitudinous, emphasized this simplification of issues; it identified him with the average man with whose psychology his repetition, brevity and emphasis on basic virtues were in accord. Some of his actions were timed with dramatic effect and surprised even his closest followers, as did his letter to John Kelly asking Grady's removal, his note to Great Britain in the Venezuelan affair, his tariff message of 1887 and his currency letter of 1891. His sudden rise to political prominence was dramatic, and though his enemies claimed that luck not ability facilitated the ascent, this argument was not without its special appeal to the average man. Some have judged Cleveland stolid and undramatic because he lacked the fiery histronics of Blaine or the oratorical gymnastics of Bryan, but the evidence indicates that his type of dramatic appeal was more politically effective than that of either Blaine or Bryan, constituting one of his most useful qualifications as a leader.

None of the high inventiveness that marked a Jefferson or Wilson as political leaders can be attributed to Cleveland. He proposed no new plans of social reform, no changes in party procedure, no new conception of American government. But in the practical milieu of party politics he exhibited two important traits that gained him a reputation for some amount of originality--the ability to cultivate suggested issues like civil service reform and government economy, both Republican brain children, and a turn for epigrammatic phrasing. "Public office is a public trust," originated by Ralphdon but attributed to Cleveland, swept the country. Such phrases as "party perfidy and party dishonor," "servants of the people," "innocuous desuetude," "tell them the

truth" caught the public fancy and memory as more literary utterances would have failed to do. Thus Cleveland gained a certain reputation for inventiveness which was for practical political purposes as good as the real article.

Cleveland's courage and reputation for courage raised him above the politicians in the public eye and constituted his most valuable qualification as a political leader. Certainly, as we have seen, he did not lack physical courage either, but it was attack on what he considered principle or right that aroused his fighting spirit, not attack on his person. His courage involved persistent clinging to conviction and defiance of attack, with willingness to risk all his political fortunes in one dramatic battle. His tariff message of 1887 was the most striking instance, but the Tenure of Office message to the Senate and the Venezuelan message were equally as intrepid. The public appeal of his displays of courage was tremendous. In fact, courage became the symbol of Cleveland's personality,[1] and a public defender stereotype was created on this basis, magnetic to people seeking assurance and safety. The aggressive nature of his courageous outbursts seized the popular imagination and provided an outlet for mass antagonisms.

Cleveland's main traits as a political leader thus emerge as facility in personal contacts, dramatic expression and a high degree of courage. In sensitivity to the moods and needs of the immediate milieu he ranks high as a practical political leader, although he lacked the greater sensitivity to broad currents of popular feeling that marks the statesman and humanitarian. Despite charges of inconsistency, he made wide individual contacts and showed considerable facility in drawing to him men of varied types. He harmonized group interests through generalization of group appeals, but with certain groups was never wholly successful, so he can be deemed only fairly facile in group contacts. In dramatic expression of conflict Cleveland excelled; his simplification of issues and identity with the fight for reform had great popular appeal. Inventive he was not, but he utilized the issues at hand and seized upon the right situation for practical returns. Courage was an outstanding asset and with this quality as the

---

[1]Allan Nevins interprets moral courage as Cleveland's most important trait.

symbol of his personality he confounded enemies and won the admiration and identification of the average man and of the historian.

Summary

Analysis of Cleveland's physical qualities on a basis suggested by Kretschmer, Bleuler and others indicates that physically Cleveland was well equipped for the stresses of public life. He was above the average in weight, height, expectations of longevity and strength of inherited constitution. His size was impressive for leadership. His voice, although not forceful, was adequate for public speaking. In his type of physique, eating habits and tendency to disease Cleveland approximates to the pyknic type described by Kretschmer. To this type Kretschmer thought certain temperamental qualities might be ascribed such as diligence, skill in handling men, astonishingly clear mind for the right moment, hastiness, easy identification with the milieu, lack of reflection, steadfastness to aim and inflexibility to the end.

In the absence of more valid tests of temperament and personality, we may apply certain interpretations of the basis of behavior that indicate the emergence of qualities found developed in the individual and significant for his rôle as a political leader. The work of Freud, Adler, Jung, Kempf and others provides a possible approach to the foundations of personality. On the three levels of behavior suggested by Freud--the id, ego, and super-ego--certain types of behavior emerged on Cleveland's career line, each type adequate or inadequate depending on the situation in which he performed. Cleveland's excess of energy, unexpressed completely through sex, humor, religion or other channels, found some outlet in hostile behavior against the immediate environment and in exaggerated expenditure of energy in work and attention to details, with rationalization of such behavior in political life on a plane of duty, service and honest administration. Professor Lasswell's work suggests an interpretation of Cleveland as a moral type of administrator.

Using another and more analytical approach, namely, that of Professor Merriam, we find that Cleveland ranks high in facility of personal contacts, in dramatic expression and in courage. However, he was not deficient in harmonizing group interests, in sensitiveness to the immediate social demands from his limited point of view or in approximating invention by using the issues

and ideas of other men. On Michels' scale Cleveland achieves a high degree of success on tests like force of will, Catonian strength of conviction and self-sufficiency but is decidedly lacking in wide extent of knowledge, celebrity in any field or special reputation for goodness of heart.[1] Conway's qualities of the crowd exponent suggest a limited test, in which Cleveland would measure well on sensitiveness, group adaptability, personal adaptability and knowledge of men. As well, he exhibits in great degree three of four traits postulated by Ross: strength of will, faith in oneself, courage and persistence, but he lacks imagination.

To approach a real understanding of Cleveland's traits as a political leader, it is necessary to study the situations in which he functioned. In the words of Professor Merriam,

> Leadership is after all a situation, a symbol of a process in the course of human action and of social action in the broader sense. The individual who is able to induce action in great masses of others does so partly by virtue of his special abilities or skills and partly by virtue of the needs which he satisfies.[2]

That process will be the concern of the following chapters.

---

[1]Robert Michels, Political Parties (New York, 1915).

[2]See forthcoming monograph Leadership by Professor Merriam.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

To evaluate Grover Cleveland as a political leader is the challenging task of this chapter. What synthesis of leadership emerges from the foregoing analysis of his personality and technique in the various situations of political life?

It is our thesis that in personality and technique Cleveland was not only the product of but the exponent of the environment in which he lived; that his early training, contacts and attitudes prepared him for recognition and response from the Americans of his generation; that his political technique and symbol expression coincided with the mood of the age in which he performed.

His ancestry, early associations and training fit Cleveland into the bourgeois environment of a rapidly expanding opportunistic unvisionary America. It was an America slightly chastened by the Gilded Age, a little more than ready for return to the moralistic symbols of its fundamental culture, but with a definite eye to the main chance and to practical issues. Lack of the conspicious in his Anglo-Saxon ancestry and Protestant antecedents placed Cleveland easily in the preferred category of American leaders of the nineteenth century. This background furnished him, too, with the narrow culture of the middle class, providing the catchwords of duty, labor, honesty with their strong appeal to the Victorian electorate, and as yet unquestioned by the intellectuals. His religious home life stimulated a self-righteous approach to various topics and furnished him a facility for moral (conscience) symbols appealing to a generation taught in the Sunday Schools. His education, deficient in knowledge of social and economic problems or literary qualities, limited to the day-by-day conservative training of a lawyer in the Buffalo courts, precluded any real grasp on his part of social issues or progressive leadership. In a cultural sense, he remained a provincial small town product in a day when provincialism characterized the measures of party politics.

His residence in New York was a part of "Cleveland luck" when the vote of New York loomed important as that of a doubtful state and in the electoral college. His early associations fortunately drew him toward the Democratic party, then (1856) representing conservative opinion, at a time when the Democratic party was beginning its hold on the Empire State, defining that combination of the South and industrial Northeast on which its victory depended.

His private life was marked by scandal and misrepresentation, but accounts of it no doubt lessened public tensions and provided an outlet for sadistic feelings accumulated in the election campaigns. The low public morality of the time, illustrated by the charges against James G. Blaine, drew popular attention from private misdeeds of the candidates for office. The adroitness of Cleveland's managers in developing governmental reform as a distracting issue must not be forgotten. How much the public secretly tolerates, if not admires signs of wickedness in its heroes, especially if involving sexual potency, the reader must decide on the basis of the persistent interest in Cleopatra, Henry VIII, and Katherine the Great.

Cleveland's physical equipment was an asset in any environment of group contacts. He was above the average in height and weight, giving an impression of ponderous dignity. He inherited an energetic constitution of immense strength. This excess of physical energy sought an outlet in work of an exacting nature or was burned up in sudden outbursts of rage or hostility not without their effectiveness in certain situations. His type of physique determined certain eating and drinking habits that brought him in contact with others and into places of eating and drinking where politicians consort. Unlike the ascetic Woodrow Wilson, he was impelled by his physical make-up into the company of others and in the Buffalo saloons learned his first lesson in politics.

Cleveland's lack of intellectual curiosity and of a liberal education fitted him well for the law, a profession almost requisite for the American political leader. His industry and attention to practical affairs brought him some recognition at the local bar, as well as the friendship of lawyers who were involved with local politics. His single track mind was an asset in analyzing an immediate situation in view of practical results

apart from theory or the broader social aspects. This ability to analyze a situation proved one of Cleveland's greatest assets as a political leader. With it existed a strain of the hostile, a cynical view of men and of practical politics. This same suspicious objectivity when applied to people made Cleveland a fairly good judge of men, since he trusted no one implicitly, a useful if unwholesome attitude in public life. His ability to memorize speeches, on which he expended some of the enormous energy, brought him early in his career to the attention of various local organizations and later impressed larger groups of auditors.

It is more difficult to ascertain and evaluate Cleveland's qualities of personality functioning in a given situation. On the hostile level, some of his traits were a decided political advantage. His sarcastic remarks gave him a respectful attention among newspapermen and the public was charmed by a president who could curse out the office seekers. The cuss word retained its frontier prestige in the America of the eighties. In spite of inconsistencies, Cleveland's undoubted ministerial background and his references to the Bible must have impressed church going people. Never questioning the conventional religious ideas of his day, Cleveland fulfilled the public expectation of a normally religious leader, making the appropriate references to God at appropriate times. His abstract expressions couched in the phrasing of the Puritan virtues appealed to a people in whom the symbolism of Puritanism was still dominant. His irritation at opposition, when verbalized on a moralizing level, associated his cause with that of right and that of his opponents with corruption and greed. Hostility directed against newspapermen found ready response among those who feared or envied the press, and fulfilled the public expectation of a leader who dared defy a great force in society. While it created enemies, the cynical tone of some of his messages to the legislature and to the Senate gave an illusion of power and dominance, not unfelt by the legislators themselves.

His ego activities suggest good adjustment to the environment in which he functioned. His independence after a series of machine-made presidents brought him attention and prestige. The legend of rugged American individualism facilitated his ascent once the public felt convinced of his freedom from dictation. In an economic milieu which was rapidly limiting the expression of the individual Cleveland's self-assertion and imperiousness evoked

response. Silence about his affairs augmented the great-man myth. The political leader not endowed with brilliance must rely greatly on persistence in carrying out policies and in developing a following. Cleveland, unimaginative and plodding, possessed this quality to a successful degree. His persistence with certain issues like tariff reform created an aura of conviction and sincerity for why, the public reasoned, should he try his political fortunes on the issues unless convinced of their rightness and soundness. His own smugness in the fight with Bryan created confidence in those about him.

In political life, according to Professor Merriam, there are times when "the appeal to arms, politically speaking, is the only alternative."[1] The leader must be ready to fight for his convictions and sometimes to show courage to begin the battle. When his ego was wounded in respect to policies he advocated or felt necessary to his advancement, Cleveland stood ready to fight. This quality of courage greatly impressed his contemporaries and even his political opponents and gave to the public a leader who expressed inhibited ego impulses of the average man.

Cleveland's greatest asset as a political leader of his generation, we will posit, was his ability to express issues on a super-ego or conscience level. This quality was especially effective in a period when the Puritan culture was disintegrating before the forces of the new economic age. Only the catchwords were left of the early democratic morality and political idealism, but people clung to them assiduously. Professor Ogburn would call this phenomenon "cultural lag." Among these symbols used and believed in, too, by Cleveland were duty, which he exemplified by constant devotion to office, honesty exemplified by civil service advocacy, responsibility as exemplified in the dignity of the executive office. These verbalizations, repeated often, synchronized with the style of the later Victorian generation and their concern with the decaying theological and ethical symbols.

We have indicated an evaluation of Cleveland's traits on the basis suggested by Professor Merriam. Cleveland excelled in most of the category to a degree that helps explain his success as a political leader. In personal contacts he showed great facility, as the evidence indicates, despite later tradition to

---

[1] Political Power (New York, 1935), p. 43.

the contrary. His ability to analyze a situation enabled him to place each individual in the position most useful to his purposes, as witness his clever use of Gorman, Whitney and Lamont as managers. His cynical insight into men's motives saved him from the disillusionments of broken pledges and from disappointments over impossible expectations. The expression of his hostile impulses created a situation of dramatic conflict, very profitable to him politically, for the public revels in drama and is always eager for a good fight. Through dramatizing issues he could suggest that the interest of the public was his own. He was undoubtedly deficient in the social sensitiveness that marks the truly great political leader and absence of this trait, although of some advantage in practical politics, detracts from his lasting reputation. He was decidedly not a man for the ages. In a day when invention in politics met the fate meted out to Henry George, Cleveland's lack of inventiveness must be placed on the credit side. More successfully, he nourished issues already current and already partially accepted by the electorate.

Cleveland's assimilation to his environment became a factor of success in his nominating campaigns. His feeling of independence and desire for certainty of approbation made him careful about making pledges, a behavior that facilitated his bid for the votes of uninstructed delegates and for the support of managers like Manning who were casting about for a candidate free from promises and party associations. His ease at verbal projection on the moral level brought a new note into New York politics at a time when the contrast with corruption would be most striking. His cynical view of men and events gave him a realistic view of politics from the beginning, very necessary for survival in that pragmatic atmosphere. It is difficult to ascertain what part of the technique in the nominating campaigns can be ascribed to Cleveland and what to his managers, but the generalization of issues, of assertion of victory with confidence, of turning the enemy's tactics to good account as dastardly manuevers reflect Cleveland's hand.

Cleveland's ego seems to have expanded with success, and he gave more and more attention to the details of campaign organization as time went on. Finally he was recognized as spokesman of the party and its inevitable candidate. Through his ability to deal generally with issues Cleveland was able to be all things

at all groups; certainly he seldom recognized special group interests as existing, and although this technique antagonized groups like the veterans and labor, it conciliated many more who interpreted his generalizations to suit themselves. This super-ego expression especially attracted the liberals and Independents whose verbal techniques were similar. The necessary repetition of shibboleths appealed to certain business elements, particularly those which benefited from the Democratic tariff policy. This technique aroused feelings of safety, for it was expressed in familiar terms. Given his facility for super ego expression, Cleveland's fitness for reform identification was inevitable. Not only his record but his constantly asserted belief in reform won many supporters. Neither was there in his advocacy of the traditional Democratic tariff anything to frighten the voters. Only in 1888 did the fear appeals of the Republicans prove stronger.

In the campaigns Cleveland's ability to analyze a situation saved him from the disadvantages of encouraging scandal as an issue, although it had been used against him, from tactless indulgence in personalities, from too much faith in promises of party workers. He could arrive at quick decisions when exigency demanded, as witness his statement claiming the election of 1884, his forcing the tariff issue in 1887, his sudden dismissal of Sackville-West in 1888. He contributed greatly to the success of Democratic publicity by his acceptance speeches and public addresses during the campaigns. All this activity he conducted in a manner of dignity with superior moral appeal very useful for Democratic success with the electorate of the eighties.

In the role of executive leader Cleveland's weakness in group contacts became evident, for as president he had to deal with definite group interests in the legislature and could not escape the necessity of cooperation. His self-assertiveness immediately brought him in conflict with men who were accustomed to power. However, his vetoes of onslaughts on the public treasury augmented his reputation as a defender of the public interest. As has been the case with most of our domineering presidents, his assertion of executive prerogative was applauded rather than condemned by the masses, who feel the president their personal representative in the government. He managed to conciliate some groups in Congress through pressure on individuals by patronage or threats. With conduct of the Cabinet his record was successful,

for he selected men whose loyalty to a chief would be unquestioned; their cooperation and friendship give evidence of his facility for dealing with individuals.

In the Pullman strike Cleveland's self-assertion and confidence led him to a course of action which placed him definitely on the side of the big business interests of the country. The limitations of his mental equipment and social outlook became painfully apparent, placing him apart from the common man and his problems. Since the organs of public opinion were opposed to labor, it is hardly surprising that his actions elicited a certain amount of approbation at the time from the substantial and respectable elements of the country, whatever may be the later verdict of the historian. In the Venezuelan affair his arrogant self-assertion became identified with defense of the Monroe Doctrine and proved a popular move, especially among groups inimical to Great Britain and with the jingoist press. As the basis of this truculent attitude toward England the psychologist might discover the unsettled economic conditions of the later nineties and the conflict of group interests easily united and diverted by the prospect of a common threat, as the Spanish War a few years later proved.[1] With this mood Clevèland's message particularly coincided and to his surprise won popularity. It was the climax of a public career dominated by ego expression.

We have indicated that Grover Cleveland was happily suited by ancestry, place of birth, early life and associations, education and outlook to the milieu in which he performed as a political leader. If he be considered mediocre, it must be remembered that he lived in a time when stirring statesmanship was not needed or appreciated. To the situation he brought qualities of self-confidence, courage, ability at personal contacts and at generalization of motives peculiarly appealing to the public of his generation. His great weakness was his lack of imagination, broad knowledge of social conditions or real understanding of the masses. However, his performance in the strange welter of American politics of the eighties and nineties, successful enough to stamp that period as "the Cleveland era," marks a height of pragmatic success that few other American political leaders have achieved.

---

[1] See Walter Millis, The Martial Spirit (Boston, 1931).